BAP
T656t

SCB
10548

THe Author of this *Examen* being (as I heare) a godly man, and of the *Presbyterian* judgement, though I am not of opinion with him (notwithſtanding any thing I have here read) viz. *That Infants are not the ſubject of Baptiſme*; yet the end of his writing, as I conceive, being the provoking of others to write, that ſo his arguments being anſwered, himſelfe and thoſe that are of his minde may receive ſatisfaction, I permit it to paſſe the Preſſe: Not doubting but ſince now (according to the deſire of many) it is knowne where the chiefe ſtrength of the *Catapædobaptiſts* lies, ſome will be found out in due time to encounter with it.

John Bachiler.

TVVO TREATISES AND AN *APPENDIX* TO THEM CONCERNING Infant-Baptiſme.

The former Treatiſe being an *Exercitation* preſented to the Chair-man of a Committee of the Aſſembly of DIVINES.
The later an *Examen* of the Sermon of Mr *Stephen Marſhall*, about *Infant-Baptiſme*, in a Letter ſent to him.

Prov. 23. 23. *Buy the truth, and ſell it not.*

Acts 8. 36,37,38. *And the Eunuch ſaid, See here is water, what doth hinder me to be baptized? And Philip ſaid, If thou believeſt with all thine heart, ἔξεστι, thou maiſt, or it is lawfull. And he anſwered, and ſaid, I believe that Jeſus Chriſt is the Son of God. And he commanded the Charet to ſtand ſtill, and they went down both into the water, both Philip and the Eunuch, and he baptized him.*

Bernard. Serm. 66. *in Cantica.*

Irrident nos quia baptizamus infantes, quòd oramus pro mortuis, quòd ſanctorum ſuffragia poſtulamus.

Joan. Lodovic. Vives Comment. in Auguſtin. tom. 5. de civit. Dei. lib. 1. cap. 27.

Nemo olim ſacro admovebatur baptiſterio, niſi adulta jam ætate, & cum idem ipſe & ſciret quid ſibi myſtica illa vellet aqua, & ſe ablui illa peteret, nec ſemel peteret. Cujus rei imaginem adhuc in noſtris infantium baptiſmis videmus. Nam rogatur etiam, num infans eo die natus, vel pridie, velitne baptizari, idq; tir: pro quo ſuſceptores reſpondent, velle. Audio in quibuſdã Italiæ urbibus morẽ veterẽ magna ex parte adhuc conſervari.

LONDON,
Printed for *George Whittington*, and are to be ſold at the ſigne of the *Blackmore* in *Biſhopſgate-ſtreete*. December 15. 1646.

TWO TREATISES

I. OF THE SACRAMENT OF BAPTISM.

II. OF THE CONSECRATING

Infant-Baptisme.

The Contents of the first TREATISE.

Pag. 1. sect. 1. *The first argument for* Infant-Baptisme *from the interest in the promise*, Gen. 17. 7. *examined.*

Pag. 5. sect. 2. *The second argument for* Infant-Baptisme, *from the succession of Baptisme to Circumcision, examined.*

Pag. 8. sect. 3. *The third argument from the parity of grace in the New Testament to that in the Old, examined.*

Pag. 9. sect. 4. *The argument from* Acts 2. 38, 39. *for* Infant-Baptisme, *examined.*

Pag. 10. sect. 5. *The argument from* 1 Cor. 7. 14. *for* Infant-Baptisme, *examined.*

Pag. 16. sect. 6. *The arguments from* Matth. 19. 15. *for* Infant-Baptisme, *examined.*

Pag. 20. sect. 7. *The argument from* Acts 16. 15. &c. *for* Infant-Baptisme, *examined.*

sect. 8. *The argument from generall promises for* Infant-Baptisme, *examined.*

sect. 9. *The argument from* Isai. 49. 22. *for* Infant-Baptisme, *examined.*

sect. 10. *The argument from* 1 Cor. 10. 2. *for* Infant-Baptisme, *examined.*

Pag. 21. sect. 11. *The argument from* Ephes. 5. 26. *for* Infant-Baptisme, *examined.*

sect. 12. *The argument from* 1 Pet. 2. 9. *for* Infant-Baptisme, *examined.*

sect. 13. *The argument from the Churches failing, if* Infant-Baptisme *be not lawfull, examined.*

Pag. 22. sect. 14. *The argument from* Heb. 6. 2. *for* Infant-Baptisme, *examined.*

Pag. 23. sect. 15. *The argument from the institution of Christ*, Matth. 28. 19. *against* Infant-Baptisme *confirmed.*

Pag. 26. sect. 16. *The argument from* John Baptist *and the* Apostles *practise against* Infant-Baptisme, *confirmed.*

Pag. 27. sect. 17. *The argument from the practise in the age next the* Apostles *against* Infant-Baptisme, *confirmed.*

Pag.28.sect.18. *The argument from the wrong originall of* Infant-Baptisme, *confirmed against it.*

Pag.29.sect.19. *The argument against* Infant-Baptisme, *from humane inventions, occasioned by it, confirmed.*

Pag.30.sect.20. *The argument against* Infant-Baptisme, *from the errors occasioned by it, confirmed.*

sect.21. *The argument against* Infant-Baptisme *from many abuses caused by it, confirmed.*

Pag.31.sect.22. *The argument from unnecessary disputes caused by it against* Infant-Baptisme, *confirmed.*

sect.23. *The argument against* Infant-Baptisme, *from the opposition to it in the middest of Popery, confirmed.*

Pag.33.sect.24. *The argument against* Infant-Baptisme, *from assertors difference about the ground of it, confirmed.*

sect.25. *The argument against* Infant-Baptisme, *from it's voyding the chiefe end of* Baptisme, *confirmed.*

The Contents of the second Treatise.

Part. 1. Concerning the antiquitie of *Infant-Baptisme.*

Pag. 1. sect.1. *The Prologue of the occasion and end of this writing.*

Pag. 3. sect. 2. *Of the stating the question, partition of the Treatise, summe of the answer to the testimonies of antiquitie for* Infant-Baptisme.

Pag.4. sect. 3. *Of the pretended testimony of* Justin Martyr.

Pag.5. sect. 4. *Of* Irenæus *his testimony.*

Pag.7. sect. 5. *Of the supposed testimony of* Origen.

Pag.8. sect. 6. *Of the testimonies of* Gregory Nazianzen, *and the Greeke Church.*

Pag.10. sect.7. *Of the testimony of* Cyprian.

Pag.12. sect.8. *Of the testimony of* Augustine.

Pag.17. sect.9. *Of the testimonies of* Hierome, *and* Ambrose.

sect.10. *Of the validitie of proofe by these testimonies, and of the evidences that* Infant-Baptisme *is an innovation.*

Part. 2. Concerning the prejudices against *Antipædobaptists,* from their miscarriages.

Pag. 19. sect. 1. *Of the fitnesse of placing the narration of miscarriages of opposers of* Pædobaptisme.

The Contents.

Pag.20. sect.2. *Of the opposers of* Infant-Baptisme *afore* Baltazar.
Pag.22. sect.3. *Of* Baltazar Paelmontanus.
Pag.23. sect. 4. *Of rebaptizing.*
sect. 5. *Of the* Anabaptists *in* Germany, *and* Antiprelatists *in* England.
Pag.25. sect.6. *Of* Anabaptists *opposing Magistracy.*
Pag.26. sect.7. *Of the hindering of reformation by* Anabaptisme.
Pag.27. sect.8. *The* Antipædobaptists *principle overthrows not the Lords day, the* Pædobaptists *principle reduceth* Judaisme, *and Popish Ceremonies, and addes to the Gospel.*
Pag.31. sect.9. *Of the evill of separating from the Ministery and Communion of Christians, by reason of this opinion.*
Pag.32. sect.10. *Of the condition into which the opinion of* Antipædobaptisme *puts the infants of believers, of originall sin, salvation out of the Church and Covenant of grace.*

Part. 3. Concerning the arguments from Scripture for *Infant-Baptisme.*

Pag. 35. sect. 1. *Of the Connexion between the Covenant and the seale.*
Pag.39. sect. 2. *Of the first conclusion concerning the identity of the Covenant of grace, for substance to Jews and Gentiles.*
Pag.40. sect.3. *Of the meaning of the second Conclusion.*
Pag.48. sect.4. *That the Covenant of grace is not made to believers and their seede.*
Pag.54. sect.5. *It is not in Gods Church like other Kingdomes.*
Pag.56. sect.6. *Of the texts, which are* Acts 2. 38, 39. Luk. 19. 9.
Pag.62. sect.7. *Of the text,* Rom. 11. 16.
Pag.69. sect.8. *Of the text,* 1 Cor. 7. 14.
Pag.83. sect.9. *Of the succession of* Baptisme, *into the place, roome and use of* Circumcision.
Pag.95. sect.10. *Of the notion under which and the reason for which persons were circumcised, shewing that all persons that were circumcised were not in the Covenant of grace.*
Pag.99. sect.11. *Of the priviledges of believers under the Gospel, and whether the want of* Infant-Baptisme, *be want of a priviledge of the Covenant of grace, which the* Jewes *had.*
Pag.110. sect.12. *That the Command to circumcise male infants, is not virtually a Command to baptize Infants.*
Pag.122. sect.13. *That* Matth. 28. 19. *is not a Command to baptize Infants, but contrary to it.*

Pag.137.

Pag.137.sect.14. *Of examples in Scripture of baptizing infants, particularly of baptizing houſholds.*

Pag.142.sect.15. *Of an infants capacitie of inward grace, the text,* Matth. 19.14. *and of the inconſequence of Pædobaptiſme thereon.*

Part. 4. Concerning the objections againſt *Infant-Baptiſme.*

Pag.151.sect.1. *Of the firſt objection from inſtitution,* Matth.28.19. *and the practiſe of* John Baptiſt, *and the Apoſtles.*

Pag.156.sect.2. *Of the ſecond objection, and therein of the condition prerequiſite to* Baptiſme.

Pag.157.sect.3. *Of the third ſo called objection, and therein of the knowledge requiſite concerning the perſon to be baptized.*

Pag.161.sect.4. *Of the fourth objection, and therein of the ſtipulation at* Baptiſme.

Pag.163.sect.5. *Of the fifth objection, and therein of the benefit that comes by* Infant-Baptiſme.

Pag.167.sect.6. *Of the ſixth objection, and therein of infant-Communion by vertue of their being in the Covenant, and the Lords Supper ſucceeding the Paſſeover.*

Pag.170.sect.7. *Of the firſt uſe, and the* Anabaptiſts *ſuppoſed bloudy ſentence.*

Pag.170.sect.8. *The Epilogue, containing ſome expreſſions and motions of the Author.*

The Content of the Appendix.

Pag.173. *That* Coloſ. 2.11,12. *proves not* Infant-Baptiſme.

ERRATA.

TReatiſe 1. Pag.7. line 24. *rationals*, read *rationale*. p 9. l.3.17.r. 7. p.10.l 20. *Mmor*, r. *Major*. p.16. l.4. *put ſuch back*, r. *put back ſuch*. p.22. l 38. dele ( ) p 28. margin. r. 18. p.29. l. 24. *baptiſme*, r. *baptiſme, may be ſupplied*. p. 34. l. 16. *as well*, r. *as well as*.

Treatiſe 2. p.4. l.29. *lived anno*, r. *lived about anno*. p.10. l.7. *differing*, r. *differing*. p.20. *hem*, r. *them*. p.22.l.13.40th, r.4th p.23.l.3.1622.r.1522. l.16. *Arian*, r. *Aerian* p 32 l.25. *character*, r. *charter*. p.40.l.32. *ſectare*, r *ſectari*. p.48. in the margin, *ſminati*, r. *ſeminati*. l.34 *words*, r. *word*. p.52.l.5.8. r.6. p.58.l.23. *thee*, r. *bee*. p.61. in the margin, 36.r.29. p.63.l.6. *inviſible*, r. *inviſible*. l.18. *viſible*, r. *inviſible*. p.(78.) l.15. *believers*, r. *unbelievers*. p.93.l.21 *Analogy*, r. *Analogy in ſome other thing* p.97. l 24. *ſort of*, r. *fort*, dele *of*. p.107. l.38. *ſecond*, r. *firſt*. p.111.l.31.1. r.2. p.114.l.38. *oppoſion*, r. *oppoſition*. p 117.l.5. *which now*, r. *which is now*. p.117.l.39.10.r.20, p.126. l.29. *duc* r. *the*. l.37. *vented*, r. *vented a conceit* p.127.l.21. *a rule*, r *a title*. p.132. in the margin, *Baby*, r. *Baylie*. p.133.l.12.17 r.18.l.15.12 r.11. p.135, l.5. *doth here*, r. *doth not here*. p.136. l. 13. 26. r. 28. p. 139.l.33.2.r.1. p.142.l.36. *this*, r. *the*. p.163. l. 6. 84. r. 48.

AN EXERCITATION ABOUT INFANT-BAPTISME;

Presented in certaine Papers, to the Chair-man of a COMMITTEE of the ASSEMBLY of DIVINES,

Selected to consider of that ARGUMENT, in the yeers, 1643, and 1644.

With some few *Emendations*, *Additions*, and an *Answer* to one new *Objection*.

Translated out of *Latine*, by the Author.

Published according to Order.

LONDON,
Printed by *M. S.* for *George Whittington*, 1646.

PROPERTY
PRINCET
REC. APR 188
THEOLOGIC
SEMINARY.

AN EXERCITATION CONCERNING Infant-Baptiſme.

THe preſent Tenent, according to which Infant-Baptiſme is practiſed, is, that the Infants born of a Believer, are univerſally to be baptized.

§. 1. The firſt Argument for Infant-baptiſme, examined from the intereſt in the promiſe, *Gen.* 17. 7.

This Doctrine and Practice conformable, is made doubtfull to me, by theſe Arguments.

Arg. 1. That which hath no teſtimony of Scripture for it, is doubtfull.

But this Doctrine of Infant-Baptiſme, hath no teſtimony of Scripture for it; *Ergo*, it is doubtfull.

The *Minor* is proved by examining the places that are brought for it, which are theſe: *Gen.* 17. 7, &c. *Acts* 2. 38, 39. 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. *Mark.* 10. 14. 16. *Acts* 16. 15. 32. 1 *Cor.* 1. 16. The Argument from *Gen.* 17. 7, &c. is almoſt the firſt and laſt in this buſineſſe; and therefore is the more accurately to be examined; but it hath ſo many ſhapes, that I may here take up that Speech, *With what knot ſhall I hold ſhape-changing Proteus?* But in the iſſue, it falls into one or other of theſe forms:

The firſt thus; To whom the Goſpel-covenant agrees, to them the ſign of the Goſpel-covenant agrees alſo. But to the Infants of Believers

the Gospel-covenant agrees; therefore to them the sign of the Gospel-covenant agrees, and consequently Baptisme. The *Minor* is proved from *Gen.* 17.7. where God promiseth to *Abraham*, *I will be a God to thee, and to thy seed after thee.*

I answer, That we may meet with this Argument, divers things are to be examined, which are taken for granted:

First, Whether the Gospel-covenant, and the Covenant made with *Abraham* be the same: Secondly, what seed of *Abraham* it is, of which it is said, *I will be a God to thee and to thy seed:* Thirdly, whether there be the same reason of circumcision and of baptisme in signing the Gospel-covenant: Fourthly, whether these terms be convertible [*Federate, and to be signed*].

Of these, I say; 1. The Covenant made with *Abraham*, is not a pure Gospel-covenant, but mixt, which I prove;

The Covenant takes its denomination from the promises; but the promises are mixt, some Euangelicall, belonging to those to whom the Gospel belongeth, some are Domestique, or Civill promises, specially respecting the House of *Abraham*, and policy of *Israel*; *Ergo.*

That was Euangelicall which we reade, *Gen.* 17.5. *I have made thee a father of many nations*; and that which we find, *Gen.* 15.5. *So shall thy seed be*; in which it is promised, that there shall be of the Nations innumerable that shall be *Abrahams* children by believing, *Rom.* 4.17,18. It was Euangelicall, which we find, *Gen.*12.3. & *Gen.*18.18. and *in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed*; for in these is promised blessing to Believers, of whom *Abraham* is father, *Gal.* 3.8,9. and by Christ, who is the seed of *Abraham*, *Gal.*3.16. *Acts* 3.25.

Domestique and Civill promises were many; of the multiplying the seed of *Abraham*, the birth of *Isaac*; of the continuation of the Covenant with *Isaac*; of the coming of Christ out of *Isaac*; the bondage of the *Israelites* in *Egypt*, and deliverance thence; of possessing the Land of *Canaan*, *Gen.* 15.13.18. *Gen.* 17.7,8. 15.16. *Act.*7.4,5,6,7,8. and many other places.

Yea, it is to be noted, that those promises which were Euangelicall, according to the more inward sense of the Holy Ghost, do point at the priviledges of *Abrahams* House, in the outward face of the words; whence it may be well doubted, whether this Covenant made with *Abraham*, may be called simply Euangelicall, and so pertain to Believers, as such, although there be Euangelicall promises in that Covenant, pertaining to all Believers, as Believers. There were annexed to the

the Covenant on *Mount Sinai*, sacrifices pointing at the sacrifice of Christ, and yet we call not that Covenant simply Euangelicall, but in some respect.

Secondly, The seed of *Abraham* is many wayes so called: First, Christ is called the seed of *Abraham*, by excellency, *Gal.* 3. 16. Secondly, all the Elect, *Rom.* 9. 7. all Believers, *Rom.* 4. 11, 12. 16. 17, 18. are called the seed of *Abraham*, that is, the spirituall seed. Thirdly, there was a naturall seed of *Abraham*, to whom the inheritance did accrue; this was *Isaac*, *Gen.* 21. 12. Fourthly, a naturall seed, whether lawfull, as the sons of *Keturah*, or base, as *Ishmael*, to whom the inheritance belonged not, *Gen.* 15. 5. But no where do I find, that the Infants of Believers of the *Gentiles* are called *Abrahams* seed, of the three former kinds of *Abrahams* seed, the promise recited, is meant, but in a different manner thus: that God promiseth, he will be a God to Christ, imparting in him blessing to all nations of the earth, to the spirituall seed of *Abraham* in Euangelicall benefits, to the naturall seed inheriting, in domestick and politicall benefits.

3. That the promise of the Gospel, or Gospel-covenant, was the same in all ages, in respect of the thing promised, and condition of the covenant, which we may call the substantiall and essentiall part of that covenant, to wit, *Christ*, *Faith*, *Sanctification*, *Remission of sins*, *Eternall life*; yet this Euangelicall covenant had divers forms in which these things were signified, and various sanctions, by which it was confirmed: To *Adam*, the promise was made under the name of the seed of the woman, bruising the head of the Serpent; to *Enoch*, *Noah*, in other forms; otherwise to *Abraham*, under the name of his seed, in whom all nations should be blessed; otherwise to *Moses*, under the obscure shadows of the Law; otherwise to *David*, under the name of a successor in the kingdome; otherwise in the New Testament, in plain words, 2 *Cor.* 3. 6. *Heb.* 8. 10. It had likewise divers sanctions. The promise of the Gospel was confirmed to *Abraham* by the sign of circumcision, and by the birth of *Isaac*; to *Moses* by the Paschall Lamb, and the sprinkling of blood on the book, the rain of Mannah, and other signs; to *David* by an oath; in the New Testament, by Christs blood, 1 *Cor.* 11. 25. Therefore circumcision signified and confirmed the promise of the Gospel, according to the form and sanction of the covenant with *Abraham*, Baptisme signifies and confirms the same promise according to the form, sanction and accomplishment of the new Testament: Now these forms and sanctions differ many

many wayes, as much as concerns our present purpose in these: First circumcision confirmed not only Euangelicall promises, but also Politicall; and if we may believe Mr. *Cameron*, in his *Theses* of the three fold Covenant of God, *Thes.* 78. *Circumcision did primarily separate the seed of* Abraham *from other nations, sealed unto them the earthly promise. Secondarily, it did signifie sanctification:* But Baptisme signifies only Euangelicall benefits. Secondly, circumcision did confirm the promise concerning Christ to come out of *Isaac*; Baptisme assures Christ to be already come, to have been dead, and to have risen again. Thirdly, circumcision belonged to the Church, constituted in the House of *Abraham*, Baptisme to the Church gathered out of all nations; whence I gather, that there is not the same reason of circumcision and baptisme, in signing the Euangelicall covenant; nor may there be an argument drawn from the administration of the one to the like manner of administring the other.

4. That some there were circumcised, to whom no promise in the covenant made with *Abraham* did belong; of *Ishmael*, God had said that his covenant was not to be established with him, but with *Isaac* and yet he was circumcised, *Gen.* 17. 20, 21. 25. *Rom.* 9. 7, 8, 9. *Gal.* 4 29, 30. the same may be said of *Esau:* All that were in *Abraham's* house, whether strangers, or born in his house, were circumcised, *Gen* 17. 12, 13. of whom nevertheless, it may be doubted, whether any promises of the covenant made with *Abraham*, did belong to them: there were other persons, to whom all, or most of the promises in the covenant pertained, that were not circumcised; this may be affirmed of the Females, coming from *Abraham*, the Infants dying before the eighth day, of just men, living out of *Abrahams* house, as *Melchisedech*, *Lot*, *Job*. If any say, that the females were circumcised in the circumcision of the Males, he saith it without proof; and by like, perhaps greater, reason it may be said, that the children of Believers are baptized in the persons of their parents, and therefore are not to be baptized in their own persons. But it is manifest that the *Jewes* comprehended in the covenant made with *Abraham*, and circumcised, were nevertheless not admitted to Baptisme by *John Baptist*, and Christs Disciples, till they professed repentance, and faith in Christ. Hence I gather, first, that the right to Euangelicall promises, was not the adequate reason of circumcising these or those, but Gods precept, as is expressed, *Gen.* 17. 23. *Gen.* 21. 4. Secondly, that those terms are not convertible, [*federate and to be signed*].

Where-

Whereupon I answer to the Argument: First, either by denying the *Major*, if it be universally taken, otherwise it concludes nothing: or by granting it with this limitation; it is true of that sign of the covenant which agrees universally in respect of form and sanction, to them that receive the Gospel, but it is not true of that sign of the covenant, which is of a particular form or sanction, of which sort is circumcision.

Secondly, I answer by denying the *Minor*, universally taken, the reason is, because those children only of believing *Gentiles*, are *Abrahams* children, who are his spirituall seed, according to the election of grace by faith, which are not known to us, but by profession, or speciall Revelation.

§. 2. The second Argument for Infant-baptisme from the succession of Baptisme to circumcision, examined.

THe second Argument is thus formed:

To whom circumcision did agree, to them Baptisme doth agree, but to Infants Circumcision did agree, therefore also Baptisme.

The *Major* is thus proved: If the baptisme of Christ succeed into the place of circumcision, then Baptisme belongs to them that circumcision belonged to; but the Antecedent is true, therefore also the Consequent. The *Minor* is proved to be true, because, *Colos.* 2. 11, 12. it is said the *Colossians* were circumcised, because they were buried with Christ in Baptisme.

For Answer: This Argument supposeth Baptisme to succeed in the place of Circumcision, which may be understood many wayes.

1. So as that the sense be, that those persons be to be baptized, which heretofore by Gods command were to be circumcised, and in this sense the Argument must proceed, if it conclude to the purpose; but in this sense it is false, for no females were to be circumcised, which yet are to be baptized, *Acts* 16. 14, 15. and Believers out of *Abrahams* house, as *Lot*, *Melchisedech*, *Job*, were not to be circumcised, but believing *Gentiles* are universally to be baptized.

2. It may be so understood, as if the rite of Baptisme then began, when the rite of circumcision did, or was of right to end; but this is not to be said: For *John Baptist* and the Disciples of Christ baptized, *Joh.* 4. 1, 2. before circumcision of right ceased, and they who first were circumcised, were after baptized, bing converted to the faith, as is manifest concerning *Paul*, *Phil.* 3. 5. *Acts* 9. 18.

3. It may be understood, as if Baptisme did succeed into the place of circumcision, in respect of its signification, which is true in some things: First, it is true that both signified the righteousnesse of faith,

Rom. 4.

Rom. 4. 11. *Rom.* 6. 3. *Gal.* 3. 27. 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. Secondly, it is true, both signified sanctification of the heart, and this is all that may be concluded out of the place alledged, *Col.* 2. 11, 12. to which I think meet to adde; that if the Text be looked into, that place speaks not of any circumcision, but of Christs circumcision in whom we are compleat, and by whose circumcision we are said to put off the body of the sins of the flesh; nor doth the Text say, we are circumcised, because we are baptized; but we are compleat in Christ, because we are circumcised in him, and buried with him in Baptisme, in which, or in whom, ye are also risen together, through the faith of the operation of God that raised him from the dead.

In some things Baptisme doth not succeed into the place of Circumcision, in respect of signification: For, first Circumcision did signifie Christ to come of *Isaac*, according to the flesh, *Gen.* 17. 10. 21. but Baptisme doth not signifie this, but points at the incarnation, death, and resurrection of Christ. Secondly, Circumcision was a sign that the *Israelites* were a people separated from all nations, *Rom.* 3. 1. but Baptisme signifieth, that all are one in Christ, *Gal.* 3. 28. Thirdly, Circumcision signified that *Moses* Law was to be observed, *Gal.* 5. 3. but Baptisme doth signifie that *Moses* his Law is made voyd, and the Doctrine of Christ to be retained, *Acts* 10. 37. Fourthly, Circumcision did sign the promise of the Land of *Canaan*, Baptisme eternall life by Christ.

From hence I answer to the Argument: First, by denying the *Major* of the fore Syllogisme. Secondly, to the conditionall Syllogisme, by denying the Consequence of the *Major*, if the Antecedent be understood of succession, in the third sense, in respect of some signification granted; but if the succession be understood in the first, second, or third sense, in respect of other significations, the *Minor* is denied; the proof from *Col.* 2. 11, 12. is already answered.

And indeed, if this Argument be not warily, and restrainedly understood, an Egge is laid, out of which manifest *Judaisme* may be hatched, but if it be taken restrainedly, no more follows thence, but that Baptisme and Circumcision in some things, signifie the same, which is more plainly said of *Noahs* flood, 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. of the red Sea, and the cloud that guided, 1 *Cor.* 10. 2. and yet we say not that Baptisme succeeded into their place, much lesse do we inferre any rite to be instituted in their stead, respecting the same persons; yea verily it is to be seriously thought on.

1. That

1. That by such Arguments drawn from Analogies, not conceived by the holy Spirit, but drawn out of our wit, a new kinde of instituting Rites, to wit, from Analogies, is brought in, besides our Lords Precepts and the Apostles examples.

2. This being once laid, by like manner of argumentation, it will be lawfull to bring into the Christian Church, under other names and forms, the whole burthen of *Jewish* Rites; yea, almost, out of what you will, to conclude what you will; for who shall put a bound to mens wits faining Analogie, when they go beyond the Lords Precepts, and the Apostles examples? It is well known, that the divine appointment of tythes to be paid, and many other things, in the writings of Divines, are asserted by this kinde of Argument, besides the rule of the Lords Precept and the Apostles example.

3. Hereby will the opinion of *Papists* be confirmed, who affirm from 1 *Cor.* 10. 11. the Sacraments of the *Jewes*, to be types of the Sacraments of *Christians*, which is rejected by Divines that dispute against *Bellarmine*.

4. This manner of arguing will countenance the Arguments of the *Papists* for an universall Bishop, because there was an High Priest amongst the *Jews*; for sacrificing Priests, because the *Jews* had such; for a linen garment at Masse, because there was such among the *Jews*; for holy water, purification of women, *Easter*, *Pentecost*, and many more such ceremonies, for which the *Papist* do in like manner argue, as appears out of *Durandus* Rationals, and other Interpreters of Rituals among the *Papists*; yea, what hindreth, but we may give children the Lords Supper, if we argue this way, sith *Samuel*, Jesus Christ under age, were partakers of the Passeover, and of right, all the males were to appeare thrice in the yeer, before the Lord; and therefore it is certain they did eat the Passeover; and it shall be after shewed, that the place, 1 *Cor.* 11. 28. will not avoyd this inconvenience, if the Text, *Matth.* 28. 19. may be shifted off, as *Pædo-baptists* use to do. Lest any man take this for a light suggestion, I will adde, that grave, godly and learned men, have often warned, that we are to take heed, that we do not rashly frame arguments from Analogie: among others in their late writings, in the *English* tongue, *John Paget*, in his *Defence of Church-government*, part. 1. chap. 3. pag. 8. and elsewhere, *John Ball* in his *Reply* to the *Answer* of the *New-England* Elders, unto the 9. *Positions*, Posit. 2. pag. 14.

Lastly, it is to be considered again and again, how by these Argu-

mentations, consciences may be freed from the danger of wil-worship and polluting so remarkable an Ordinance of Christ as Baptisme is, specially this care lies on them, who by Prayers, Sermons, Writings, Covenants and Oaths, do deterre *Christians* from humane inventions, in Gods worship diligently, and as is to be hoped sincerely.

§.3. The third Argument from the parity of grace in the new Testament to that in the old examined.

THe third Argument is thus framed.

If Baptisme be not granted to the Infants of Believers, then the grace of God will be more restrained in the new Testament then in the old: but this is not to be affirmed; therefore Baptisme is to be granted to Infants of Believers.

Answ. 1. If this Argument be of any weight, it will prove that the grace of God is straitened, because we give not the Lords Supper to children, to whom the Passeover was given, as appears by that which was above said.

2. The grace of God is not tied to Sacraments, neither do Sacraments give grace by the work done, and therefore grace is not restrained, though Sacraments be never granted, grace is not denyed to an excommunicated person, who is inhibited the Lords Supper, the Grace of God is free, whether we understand it of the divine affection, or the effects of it; nor can be made larger or narrower by our act.

3. Yet it is not absurd to say, that in respect of some priviledges, the Grace of God is more contracted in the new Testament then in the old: For instance, no family hath now the priviledge that was granted to *Abrahams* family, that out of it Christ should be born; no man besides *Abraham* is called *The father of the faithfull*; no woman besides one, *The mother of Christ*; nevertheless, simply the grace of God is said to be larger in the new Testament, by reason of the revelation of the Gospel imparted to all nations, the more abundant communication of the holy Spirit, and more plain manifestation of the mysterie of the Gospel: I would have it weighed, whether those phrases of the Apostle, *Rom.* 11.21. as *the naturall branches*, ver. 24. *The wilde Olive by nature*, were't *graffed contrary to nature*. *These which be naturall branches*, do not sufficiently imply, that the *Jewes* children by their birth had a priviledge beyond the *Gentiles* children.

Thereupon I answer to the Argument: First, by denying the consequence of the *Major*, for the reason given: Secondly, by denying the *Minor*, if it be understood of straitning the grace of God, in respect of some priviledge, although the Assumption may be granted, if under-

understood of the straitning Gods grace simply.

The summe of the Answer to the Arguments, drawn from *Gen.* 17. 17. is this: The Sacraments are not to be administred according to rules taken from our reasonings, but Gods appointment. Rightly doth Mr. *Ball* forenamed, in the Book forenamed, *Posit.* 3. & 4. *pag.* 38. say, *But in whatsoever Circumcision and Baptisme, do agree or differ, we must look to the institution, and neither stretch it wider, nor draw it narrower then the Lord hath made it, for he is the institutor of the Sacraments according to his own good pleasure; and it is our part to learn of him, both to whom, how, and for what end the Sacraments are to be administred, how they agree, and wherein they differ, in all which we must affirm nothing, but what God hath taught us, and as he hath taught us.*

§. 4. The Argument from *Act.* 2. 38, 39. for Infant-baptisme examined.

THe Argument from *Acts* 2. 38, 39. may be thus formed: To whom the promise is made, they may be baptized; but to the Infants of Believers the promise is made, therefore they may be baptized.

The *Minor* is proved from the words of *vers.* 39. for the promise is made to you and to your children.

That an Answer may be fitted to this Argument:

1. It is to be observed, that the promise made, is the sending of Jesus Christ, and blessing by him, as it is expounded, *Acts* 3. 25, 26. *Acts* 13. 32, 33. *Rom.* 15. 8, 9.

2. That the Text saith, the promise was made to them he spake to, and their children, then to them that are afarre off, who, whether they be *Gentiles*, who are said to be afarre of, *Ephes.* 2. 12. or *Jewes*, in future ages and generations, as *Beza* thinks, are limited by the words closing the verse, *as many as the Lord our God shall call*, which limitation plainly enough shewes the promise to appertain to them not simply as *Jewes*, but as called of God, which is more expressly affirmed, *Acts* 3. 26. *To you, God having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to blesse you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquity:* or, as *Beza*, *Every one of you turning your selves from your iniquities*; therefore the promise here is not said to be made but with condition of calling, and faith, which may be confirmed aboundantly from *Rom.* 4. 13, 14. 16. *Gal.* 3. 9. 14. 22.

3. That *Peter*, vers. 38. doth exhort to repentance and Baptisme together, and in the first place perswades to *Repentance*, then *Baptisme*, which shewes *Repentance* to be in order before *Baptisme*.

4. That mention is made of the promise, not as of it self, yeelding right to *Baptisme* without *Repentance*, but as a motive, inciting together, to Repentance and Baptisme. Whereupon it is answered:

1. That the *Major* is to be limited, to whom the promise is made, they may be baptized, to wit, when they are called, and have shewed signes of repentance; If it be taken without limitation, it is to be denied.

2. By denying the *Minor*, if it be universally taken of all Infants of Believers, of whose Baptisme the question is; as for the Text, it speaks not expresly of Infants, but of children indefinitely; nor of the children of the *Gentiles* at all, (of whom we are) but of the children of the *Jews*, and therefore, if that promise be extended to Infants, which doth not appear, the promise is to be expounded so, as to note something peculiar to the *Jews* Infants.

§. 5. The Argument from 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. for Infant-Baptisme, examined.

THe Argument from the place, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. may be thus formed: They who are holy with Covenant-holinesse, may be baptized: But the Infants of a Believer are holy, with a Covenant-holinesse; for it is said in the Text, *but now they are holy*; therefore they may be baptized. I answer:

1. The *Minor* is not true, universally understood, as is manifest from *Rom.* 11. 16. where it is said, *If the first fruits be holy, so is the lump: if the root be holy, so are the branches.* The sense is, that *Abraham* is the first fruits, and holy root; the elect *Israelites* are the branches and lump; so that it followes, that the elect of the *Israelites* not yet called, are holy in respect of the Covenant, and are not yet therefore to be baptized; for although they may be said to be holy in regard of the Covenant, of old entred into with *Abraham*, and the gracious respect of God to them, to be manifested in opportune time, yet in their present state, before calling, they denying Christ, neither Infants nor grown men are to be baptized, unlesse we would have the branches broken off to be graffed into the Church; and therefore, although the sense were in the place of 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. your children are holy with Covenant-holinesse, by reason of Gods gracious favour to be manifested in due time, yet it will not follow, that they are to be baptized, who have not yet yeelded any shewes of divine grace.

2. The *Minor* is not proved from the place alledged: For it doth not speak of federall holinesse, but of holinesse, that I may so call it, Matrimoniall, so that the sense is, your children are holy, that is, legitimate.

timate. Whether any in the ages before, the age last past, expounded it, of federall holinesse, as they call it, I am not yet certain: as for the exposition of that place, of that holinesse, I called Matrimoniall, of it the place is expounded by *Aquinas*, in his *Commentary* upon the place, and perhaps by others, whom I have not yet had time to look into, but I think best to set down the words of *Joachimus Camerarius*, about this matter, in his *Commentary* on the new Testament, lately printed at *Cambridge*; [*for the unbelieving husband hath been sanctified*] *an usuall change of the Tense, that is, is sanctified, in the lawfull use of marriage, for without this* (he saith) *it would be, that their children should be unclean*, that is, *infamous, and not legitimate, who so are holy*, that is, *during the marriage are without all blot of ignominy:* Moreover, *Melanchthon* in his *Commentary* on the place, *Therefore* Paul *answers, that the marriages are not to be pulled asunder, for their unlike opinions of God, if the impious person do not cast away the other*; and for comfort he addes as a reason, *the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the believing wife*, of which Speech divers interpretations are made, but the true and naturall is this, as elsewhere, he saith, *Meat is sanctified, for that which is holy in use, that is granted to Believers from God, so here he speaks the use of marriage to be holy, and to be granted of God,* [*else were*] *the interpretation of the* Sept. *so speaks unclean, it calls unclean that which is prohibited; as wee say Swines flesh was unclean by the Law of* Moses, *that is, prohibited, or a woman brought to bed, is unclean*, that is, *whose touching is forbidden. The connexion of the Argument is this: If the use of marriage should not please God, your children would be bastards, and so unclean; but your children are not bastards, therefore the use of marriage pleaseth God: How bastards were unclean in a peculiar manner, the Law shewes*, Deut. 23. *Let not a bastard enter into the Congregation of the Lord, to the tenth generation*, that is, *Let him be admitted to no function in the Church; therefore this is the most plain meaning, children are not bastards, nor to be kept away, as the Law of* Moses *kept them away; therefore also the use of marriage pleaseth God.* Musculus *Comment.* on 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. hath these words; [*is sanctified*] *this expresseth the reason of that which he saith, Let him not put her away; perhaps, the more unskilfull Christians thought such dwelling together to be unclean and unlawfull; and they did fear, lest they should be made one body with the yoak-fellow that was an Idolater, as he that is joyned to an Harlot, is made one body with the Harlot, and so of the members of Christ, should make them members of*

an

an Idolater, which hath more sin then if they should make them the members of an Harlot; for this cause, he saith, for the unbeliever is sanctified, &c. that is, for the unbelieving husband in the wife, that is, in the conjunction of the wife, which is by marriage, even long ago hath been cleansed by vertue of marriage; so that his conjunction and copulation, hath nothing unclean: so in like manner also, the unbelieving wife, by reason of lawfull wedlock, in which shee is joyned to the man, even long ago is cleansed, that the believer is not defiled, if she live together with him; for the word holinesse here, is taken for the cleannesse of the marriage-bed which he hath by the tradition of God, therefore he saith, else your children should be unclean, but now they are holy, he should have said, but now they are clean, if to be holy, and clean, in this place were not the same.

Therefore the most plain understanding of this place is, first, in that we understand not the word holinesse, of that holinesse which is by the covenant of God, or the Spirit of faith, by which Believers are sanctified, as a people of God, but of the holinesse of the conjugall bed, otherwise it will bring forth a troublesome dispute, how an unbelieving husband may be said to be sanctified. Then, that we attribute this sanctification that is cleannesse, not to the faith of the believing yoak-fellow, but to the marriage, by reason of the appointment of God; with Hierome, who saith, because by Gods appointment, marriage is holy; and Ambrose, who hath it thus, the children are holy, because they are born of lawfull marriage; therefore, that in the wife and in the husband, is not to be read with the addition of Believer, as the old Interpreter hath it, but simply, as the Greek hath it; if any thing be to be added, it is better to be added, the lawfull wife or husband, that we may understand, that the unbelieving husband is cleansed in his lawfull wife, that is, by vertue of their lawfull marriage, is not unclean, but clean, as far as appertains to the law of cohabitation of marriage, although he be impure so far as appertains to the commerce of Religion, of which the word of Deacons in the Church was Let the prophane depart, the holy draw neer. [else your children] Ambrose so expounds this particle [else] that is, if thou the believing husband shouldst put away thy unbelieving wife, and marry another, your children should be unclean, because you should be made Adulterers, but [now] that is, if thou retain thy unbelieving wife, they are holy, because they are born of a lawfull marriage. But it is more plain, that we understand the Apostle, to have respect to the sanctimony of marriage, even of them who without the faith of Christ, are conjoyned in marriage, as if he had said unless

unlesse marriage were holy and clean, even between unbelievers, what other thing would follow, then that all the children of Infidels are bastards, and unclean? but far be it from us to say so; they are holy, for they are born of lawfull marriage. Ambrose *looks to that which he said,* Let him not put her away; *the other Exposition to that which he said,* the unbelieving husband is sanctified in the wife. *I have sometimes abused the present place against the error of* Anabaptists, *keeping back Infants of Christians from Baptisme, thinking that speech,* but now are they holy, *to be the same, as, they are the people of God, by reason of the believing parents; but although it be sure in it self, that the children of believers, are both holy, and pertaining to the people of God, by reason of the participation of the Covenant, and so are partakers of Baptisme, as the sign of the Covenant, yet the present place makes nothing to this cause, in which the sanctimony of the Covenant and people is not meddled with; but the cleannesse of lawfull marriage even of Infidels: for not only to children, to whom perhaps, the holinesse of a believing parent, may so appertain, that for it they may be partakers of the Covenant, but also to unbelieving husbands and wives is sanctimony ascribed, although they oppose the Christian faith; nor is any other holinesse or cleannesse of children meddled with, then that which agrees also to unbelieving parents, for to them, no other agrees, then that which is by lawfull marriage. There's other testimonies out of Scripture, from whence the* Anabaptists *may be convinced of error; so that there is no need to use this place against them.* Thus far *Camerarius, Melanthon, Musculus.*

Perhaps some one will object, that no where is *holy,* the same with legitimate: to which I answer, That holinesse is put for Chastity, is manifested from 1 *Thes.* 4. 3. 4. 7. and the word [*sanctified*] in this place, what doth it sound else, then [*is lawfully coupled*] and [*is sanctified*] 1 *Tim.* 4. 5. what else doth it signifie, then [*is lawfully used*]? at which place *Beza* hath these words, *Therefore meats are said to be sanctified, which we use lawfully, and with Gods good leave; he alludes to legall purifications, and the difference between clean and unclean meats:* And why may not by a like allusion, unclean, be put for Bastards, and holy for legitimate? for the Bastard is among the unclean, *Deut.* 23. 2. To which I may adde what *John Calvin* hath on *Mal.* 2. 15. *Wherefore hath God made one?* to wit, *seeking a seed of God; a seed of God is here taken for legitimate, as the* Hebrewes *do name that divine what soever doth excell, yea, they call that divine which is pure from any fault and spot: therefore he sought a seed of God, that is, appointed marriage; from whence*

should

should be born a legitimate and clean off-spring. Secretly therefore doth the Prophet here shew, that they are all bastards, that shall be born by polygamy, because they neither can, nor ought to be counted legitimate sons, but they who are begotten according to Gods institution, but where the husband violates the faith given to the wife, and takes to himself another, as he perverts the order of marriage, so also he cannot be a lawfull father. Thus *Calvin*, and in like manner *Cameron* prælect. in *Mat.* 19.5. interprets that Text.

Lastly, if the words of the Text be weighed, this will seem the only and genuine sense; for the question which the Apostle resolves was, whether the conjunction was to be retained of the believing yoak-fellow, with the unbelieving? The reason of doubting was, because that conjunction seems impure, by reason of the impurity of the unbelieving yoak-fellow; the Apostle answers, not so: For the unbelieving husband hath been sanctified in the wife. To draw out the sense of this place, it is to be noted, that [*the unbelieving husband*] sounds the same, as if he had said, [*the husband, though he be an unbeliever*]; for the scope requires that this be the sense, the *Husband*, though he be an *unbeliever*, yet is sanctified in the wife.

2. That it is not said, *in the believing wife*, nor *in the believing husband* (though I deny not *Beza* observed some such thing in the *Clermont* copy, and elsewhere): For the copies do not so reade, and it seems the Apostle of purpose so spake, that the reason of *Sanctification* may be intimated to be taken, not from the faith of the yoak-fellow, but conjugall relation.

3. [Ἐν] is not rightly rendred, [*by*] in the vulgar and our *English* translation, as if the sense were, that the faith of the wife, were the cause of sanctifying the unbelieving husband, for this sense cannot be fastened to this place; for no man will say, the faith of the unbelieving wife, sanctifies the unbelieving husband federally; so that the unbelieving husband should be capable of Baptisme by his wifes faith, (which yet, by the good leave of such men be it said, doth as well follow from this place, as that the son is federally holy, and capable of Baptisme, for the faith of the parent) neither can it be said, that the parent is sanctified with spirituall sanctification by the faith of the wife; for how ever it be determined that faith is the cause of inward sanctification, yet it is certain that the faith of one is not the cause of the sanctification of another, I mean, the next and effectuall cause. Nor doth this sense pertain hither, the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, that is, is renued in the spirit of his mind, by the diligence of

of his wife, instructing him in the faith, as she is said to save, *vers.* 16. For this sanctification being put, the children may remain impure, and not holy; the contrary whereof is here asserted: and this sanctification is contingent, it may be, or it may not be, as is manifest from *vers.* 16. For how knowest thou? But in this place the sanctification is certain and necessary, else it should not take away the doubt, about the retaining the conjunction; nor doth the sense pertain hither, the unbelieving husband is sanctified in the wife, that is, the wife, because she hath faith, hath used the unbelieving husband without all scruple of conscience; for the contrary was the occasion of this Discourse; nor doth this belong a whit to the impurity or holinesse of the children; therefore more rightly [ἐν τῇ γυναικὶ] is rendred in *Latine* in the Dative, [to the wife] for the particle ἐν, is often so used, as *Gal.* 1. 16. ἐν ἐμοὶ, to me, 2 *Pet.* 1. 5. ἐν τῇ πίστει, to faith, *Acts* 4. 12. ἐν ἀνθρώποις, to men; and 1 *Cor.* 7. 15. ἐν τῇ εἰρήνῃ, is rendred by *Beza* unto peace: the sense then is, that the unbelieving husband is sanctified to the wife, that is, is not coupled as an unclean fornicator, but as a lawfull husband, and that copulation is holy, that is, remains chast, the unbeliever remaining a husband; for an unbeliever is a husband, and therefore the use of him is chast, [else] the Apostle proves what he had said, of the sanctification of the unbelieving husband, to the wife, and the order being turned, by an argument from an absurdity, which may be reduced unto this form: Mat. 17. 12. Acts 7. 44.

If the unbelieving husband be not sanctified to the wife, and the order turned, then your children should be unclean; but your children are not unclean, but holy; *Ergo.* [ἐπεὶ ἄρα, else] plainly shewes, that absurdity would follow, if this were not granted, that the unbelieving husband is sanctified to the wife, ἐπεὶ ἄρα, otherwise certainly, as *Beza* renders it, your children are unclean, that is, your children which you have have hitherto begotten, should be unclean, that is, bastards, but now they are holy: [*but now*] *Beza* rightly notes it, *is not an Adverb of time, but a Conjunction, that is wont to be used in the Assumptions of Arguments*, and the sense is, [*but now*] that is, but for as much as the unbelieving husband is sanctified to the wife, that is, in respect of the use of the wife, your children are holy, that is, lawfully begotten and born; but if it be granted the sanctification is understood of lawfull and chast use, (which is necessarily to be yeelded) and yet the uncleanesse and holinesse be understood of that which they call federall, then this will follow, that the children born of wives superadded to the first, incestuous, concubines and harlots are not with-

in the Covenant, neither to be circumcised nor baptized, whereas not only *Ishmael* by *Abraham*, but also many sons of *Jacob*, the sons of *Judah*, *Pharez* and *Zarah* by *Thamar*, were circumcised; nor doth custome or canon put such back children from Baptism; but in very deed, this cannot be the sense, for only holines, which I call Matrimoniall, of the children, followeth from Matrimoniall lawfull copulation, which is here asserted, and only uncleanesse opposite to legitimation, follows illegitimate, and polluted copulation, and of these alone there was doubt amongst the *Corinthian* Christians, and therfore the Apostles resolution.

Nor yet, as *Beza* inferres, if this sense be put, should the Apostle draw an argument from civill Laws, to pacifie conscience, but he using his Apostolicall authority, resolves the doubts in this Chapter, and teacheth, that according to Gods Law, and Christs Precept, the marriage is not dissolved by the infidelity of either yoak-fellow, but that they may lawfully dwell together, and couple, according to Gods institution of Marriage. As for that which *Beza* saith, *No man hath ever said truly, that marriage is holy between two unbelievers, and that their children are holy, sith their meats are unclean to them, as being to be sanctified by the Word, and giving of thanks*; it is true, if we speak of the sanctification of the heart, but it is manifest from that which is before said, that the Apostle speaks of the sanctification and sanctity, that is in chastity, and legitimation, and in respect of it *Beza* grants the marriage of Infidels not to be accounted before God for fornication; for marriage is honourable among all, even unbelievers, and the bed undefiled, but Whoremongers and Adulerers God will judge, *Heb.* 13.4. but honour and holinesse sound the same, 1 *Thes.* 4.4.

§. 6. The Arguments from *Mat.* 19. 15. for Infant-Baptisme examined.

THe Argument from *Mat.* 19. 15. *Mar.* 10. 14. 16. *Luke* 18. 15, 16, 17. may be formed in divers manners: First thus; they are to be baptized, whom Christ commands to be brought to him, being moved with indignation towards his disciples, that repelled them.

But Christ commands Infants to be brought to him. *Ergo.* That this Argument may be examined, it is to be considered:

1. Who they were that brought these children.
2. What little children they were that were brought.
3. Upon what motives.
4. To what end.
5. What time.
6. In what place they brought them.
7. For what cause the Apostles did repell them.
8. For what cause Christ being angry with the Apostles, commanded them to be brought.

In

In many of these, we have scarce any thing beside conjectures, which we may follow, neither have I leisure or books to look into all things which *Commentators* have discoursed concerning these heads.

As for the first, it it is supposed that the bringers were either parents, or other believers, who at least wished well to the little children; which is probable from the end for which they brought them, to wit, that he might blesse them, and pray for them, for this shewed faith and love.

As for the second, it is probable they were children of *Jews*, because this was done in the coasts of *Judea*, *Mat.* 19. 1. *Mar.* 10. 1. But whether the parents of the children believed in Christ or otherwise, is not manifest.

As for the third, concerning the motive, there is little certain, whether it were upon the sight, or hearing of that which Christ did, *Mat.* 18. 2. or from a custome among the *Jews*, of seeking the blessing of Prophets and holy men, for their little ones, as *Rebecca* for *Jacob*, *Joseph* for his sons; or from the fame of things done upon the praiers of Christ; or an instinct from God, that occasion might be given of teaching the things that Christ taught upon this matter; or some other motive.

As for the fourth, the end is expressed by *Matthew*, that he might put on hands and pray; by *Mark* and *Luke*, tha the might touch them, which tends to impart a blessing.

As for the fifth, *Matthew* points at the time, by the particle [*then*] and both *Mark* and *Matthew*, put it after the dissertation, with the *Pharisees* concerning divorce, and the answer to the Disciples exception, which *Mark* testifies was made in the house; *Luke* puts it after the parable of the *Publican* and the *Pharisee*, but he is wont to relate things out of their right place. But what the holy Spirit doth intimate, by noting the time precisely, I guesse not, unlesse perhaps he would have it noted, that an occasion was opportunely ministred, of amplifying the argument concerning making a mans self an Eunuch for the kingdome of heaven, though this reason doth not very much like me.

As for the sixth, the place is intimated, *Mat.* 19. 1. *Mar.* 10. 1. *in the coasts of Judea, beyond Jordan*, in Matthew; *By the farther side of Jordan*, in Mark; about which it availeth not to our present purpose to inquire.

As for the seventh, the reason of repelling, is not known, but by conjecture, it is probable this bringing of little children, was troublesom to them, either because it did interrupt Christs Speech about marriage, and fitness to the Kingdom of heaven, or because they sought rest in the house, or because they did think this bringing would be in vain.

As for the eighth, Christ without doubt, was angry with the Disci-

ple, because they hindred the occasion of doing good to men, whereas Christ went about doing good, *Act.* 10. 38. And in this business the faith of the bringers was to be cherished, and the power of blessing in Christ was to be manifested, & the excellent doctrine to be delivered, concerning little childrens being capable of the Kingdome of heaven, of the quality of them who receive the Kingdome of heaven; but whether Christ would that this fact should remain, as a perpetuall rule for baptizing the Infants of Believers, is yet a question. It seems, scarce probable it should be so.

1. Because Baptisme of Infants, being meerly positive, so obscure and doubtfull an institution, is without example and reason.

2. Because we find no practice or hint in Scripture, which may expound this fact to this sense.

3. Because, if he had given a command to the Apostles of baptizing Infants, he had rather said, bring the little children to me, then suffer them to be brought to me.

4. He had declared whose Infants he would have baptized, and not have spoken so indefinitely, it is certain, before the command, *Mat.* 28. 19, 20. There is no Precept extant, concerning baptizing *Gentiles*, much lesse concerning baptizing the Infants of the *Gentiles*.

5. The words, *suffer & forbid not*, and τὰ παιδία, *these little children*, as *Beza* reads, shew that Christs words are meant only of those children.

6. If this fact pertain to Baptisme, then we must say, that Christ baptized, the contrary whereof is said, *Joh.* 4. 2. As for that which is objected, that three Euangelists rehearse this fact, that thence a perpetuall rule may be drawn, of bringing Infants to Christ by an outward Ordinance, which is not done but by Baptisme, it is weak: For,

1. Three Euangelists rehearse the bringing of the palsie man to Christ, the accesse of the leprous person to Christ, and many other things, from which yet no perpetuall rule is formed.

2. If any rule be hence to be formed, that is to be perpetually observed, this relation will serve more fitly to establish Episcopall confirmation, by laying on hands, and praying, then Presbyteriall baptisme.

Secondly, we must distinguish, concerning bringing to Christ; there is a bringing to Christ, by locall admotion, there is another bringing to Christ by spirituall instruction; this bringing to Christ, is the cause of Baptisme, not the other: for many were brought by the command of Christ, to Christ, as the blind son of *Timæus*, and others, of whose baptisme, or conversion we reade not; for not all that were corporally healed by Christ, were also spiritually healed, as we are to say of the nine Lepers, *Malchus*, and others. 3. The

3. The Argument supposeth they may be baptized, whom Christ ommands to be brought, but neither is this true of spirituall bringing; or not those whom he commands to be brought spiritually, are to be aptized, but those whom he hath brought; as for that which is said, hey are repelled from Christ, that are repelled from Baptisme, it is a ght thing, for Baptisme doth not bring men to Christ, unlesse the per-ons be first in Christ; neither is therefore any man repelled from Christ, ecause he is not baptized, but when he is kept back, being fit for baptism.

To the Argument therefore answer is made, by denying the *Major* niversally taken.

Secondly, the Argument is thus formed:

Arg. Those whom Christ imbraced, laid his hands on, blessed, may e baptized; But Christ imbraced Infants, &c. *Ergo.*

Answ. I answer, this argument supposeth these acts of Christ, to have een all one, as if he had baptized, but this is said without proof, in very eed, that act of blessing was more then Baptisme, and yet it had not the me reason with Baptisme; it is manifest out of *Joh.* 4.2. that Baptisme as an act of ministry, which Christ did not exercise by himself, but his isciples, but that blessing was an act, by which he obtained some singu-r gift from God by prayers for those Infants, upon whom he had laid is hands; nor is this benefit said to be bestowed on them for the faith of eir parents, but out of singular favour which Christ bestowed upon any, as *Lazarus*, with his sisters, *John* the Apostle and others, there-re the *Major* Proposition is to be denied; for there is no connexion be-veen this act, which is extraordinary, and the act of ordinary ministe-, which is to be fulfilled according to the Lords prescription.

The third Argument is thus formed.

Arg. They may be baptized, whose is the Kingdome of heaven; but Infants is the Kingdome of heaven; *Ergo.*

Answ. I answer, the *Major* Proposition is true, if it be understood of ose whose is the Kingdome of heaven, when it appears that the King-me of heaven belongs to them, otherwise it is not true. Secondly, it not said in the Text [*of Infants is the kingdom of heaven*] but, *of such the kingdome of heaven*; and Christ expounds what he means, *Mar.* 10. 5. *Luke* 18.17. to wit, of them who in humility of mind, are like little ildren, as it is *Mat.* 18.3,4. but if [*of such*] be to be expounded, as *Beza* ould, *Annot.* in *Mat.* 19. 14. *of these and the like*, as above, 18. it is not oved from thence, that the kingdome of heaven pertains to all Infants Believers, but to them whom he then blessed, and to those persons who her are so blessed, or are converted and humble as little children.

Whence

Whence it is answered; first by denying the *Major*, if it be expound
universally and unrestrainedly: secondly, by denying the *Minor*, as
is put indefinitely, for the reasons above put.

§. 7. The Argument from *Acts* 15. 16. &c. for Infant-Baptisme examined.

THe Argument from the place, *Act.* 16, 15. 32. 33. *Act.* 18. 8. 1 *Cor.* 16. is thus formed: If the Apostle baptized whole housholds, th
Infants; but the Apostle baptized whole housholds, *Ergo.*

Answ. This Argument rests on a sleight conjecture, that there we
Infants in those houses, and that those Infants were baptized, where
the words of the Text evince not these things, yea, those things whi
are said, *Acts* 16. 32. *He spake the Word of the Lord to him, and to all in h
house*; and vers. 33. *He rejoyced, believing God with all his house. Act.* 18.
Crispus *believed the Lord with his whole house*, do plainly prove, that u
der the name of *the whole house*, are understood those only that heard th
Word of God and believed. Whence it is answered by denying th
consequence of the *Major* Proposition.

Some other arguments occur, which make a number without strengt

§. 8. The Argument from generall promises for Infant-baptisme examined.

FIrst, it is argued from generall promises, made to the godly and the
seed, *Exod.* 20. 6. *Psal.* 112. 2, &c. Whence it is gathered, that Gc
makes a difference betwixt the children of the godly and the wicke
that he promiseth blessing to those, not to these, therefore the childr
of the godly are to be baptized, not the other.

Answ. The promises recited, are first generall and indefinite; secondl
for the most part concerning corporall good things; thirdly, with th
exception of free election; fourthly, to be understood with the imply
condition of faith and repentance, and so they serve not to this purpo

§ 9. The Argument from *Isa.* 49. 22. for Infant-Baptisme examined.

SEcondly, from *Isai.* 49. 22. it is foretold that *Gentiles* should brir
their sons in their arms, and their daughters on their shoulder
therfore the Prophet foresaw in spirit, the baptisme of the little on
of the *Gentiles.*

Answ. First, little ones might be brought for other ends then bap
tisme, as *Mat.* 19. 15.

Secondly, I will use the words of *Francis Junius* in his *Annot.* on th
place, All these things are said Allegorically, of the spirituall amplifica
tion of the kingdome of Christ, as the Prophets are wont, they are fu
filled in the perswasions in which the *Gentiles* exhorted their childre
to imbrace Christ.

§. 10. The Argument from 1 *Cor.* 10. 2. for Infant-Baptisme examined.

THirdly, from 1 *Cor.* 10. 2. All our fathers were baptized, therefo
also Infants.

I answer, first, if this verse prove that Infants were baptized, the vers
following will prove that they received the Lords Supper.

2. Th

2. The ſenſe is not that they were formally baptized, with the rite of Baptiſme, begun by *John Baptiſt*, and ordained by Chriſt; but that by a like repreſentation, the ſea and the cloud ſignified ſalvation to them by Chriſt as baptiſme doth to us, and that they were in a like condition, as if they had been baptized.

§. 11. The Argument from *Eph.* 5. 26. for Infant-Baptiſme examined.

FOurthly, from *Epheſ.* 5. 26. where it is ſaid, that Chriſt cleanſed the Church with the waſhing of water through the Word, therefore Infants either belong not to the Church, and ſo are excluded from the benefit of Chriſts death, or they are to be baptized.

Anſw. If this Argument be of force, the thief crucified with Chriſt, and repenting on the croſſe, Infants, *Catechumeni*, Martyrs, and others, dying before baptiſme, are excluded out of the Church, and from the benefit of Chriſts death; we are therefore to ſay, that either the Church is taken for the more famous part of the Church, or that purification is to be underſtood of that, which is for the moſt part.

§. 12. The Argument from 1 *Pet.* 2. 9. for Infant-baptiſme examined.

FIfthly, from 1 *Pet.* 2. 9. Believers are called *a choſen generation, a holy nation*, which things are ſaid of the *Iſraelites*, *Exo.* 19. 5, 6. therefore Believers of the nations obtain the ſame birth-priviledges, which the *Iſraelites* had, and therefore their children are within the Covenant, and to be baptized as the children of the *Iſraelites* were to be circumciſed.

Anſw. 1. If this Argument proceed, it will follow, that there is ſome nationall-church among the *Gentiles*, as of old among the *Jews*, which is not to be granted, which I would have underſtood in this ſenſe, there is now no ſuch nationall-church, as amongſt the *Iſraelites*, ſo as that a perſon ſhould be accounted a member of a church, in that he is an *Engliſhman*, *Scot*, *Dutchman*, &c. In this ſpeech I oppoſe not them which affirm the outward government of the Church ſhould be ſubject to nationall Synods. 2. *Exod.* 19. 5, 6. God ſpeaks not of a priviledge flowing from birth, but obedience. 3. The Epiſtle was written to the diſperſed *Jewes*, and therefore the Argument lies liable to exception, when it is drawn from that which is ſaid to the *Jews*, as if it were ſaid of the *Gentiles*. 4. But letting theſe things paſſe, the ſenſe is, *ye which believe*, as it is *verſ.* 7. whom God hath called out of darkneſſe, are a holy nation, whether *Jews* or *Gentiles*, by ſpirituall generation, as Believers are called a family or kindred, *Epheſ.* 3. 15. the houſhold of faith, *Gal.* 6. 10. the houſe of God, 1 *Tim.* 3. 15. a people, 1 *Pet.* 2. 10. wherefore in this family, kindred, houſe, people, are only Believers, whom not carnall birth, but ſpirituall cauſeth to be reckoned in that number.

§. 13. The Argument from the

SIxthly, the Church of God fails not, but we muſt ſay, the Church of God hath failed, if baptiſme of Infants be not lawfull, *Ergo*.

Anſw. 1. The

churches failing, if infant-baptisme be not lawfull examined.

Answ. 1. The Church of God may consist without baptisme, as in th crucified converted thief, &c. Secondly, neither perhaps, is it necessary t be said, that the baptisme of Infants, because not lawfull, is therefore *nu* Thirdly, there was in the Church Baptisme of persons grown, in all ages *Ludov. Vives* in his *Comment.* upon *Aug. de Civit. Dei.* lib. 1. cap. 27. hat these words, *No man of old was brought unto* * *the place of holy baptisme unle[ss] be were of grown age already, and when the same person knew what that mystica water meant, and desired to be washed in it, and that more then once, an Image which thing we see yet, in our baptisme of Infants; for as yet the Infant, thoug born the same day, or the day before, is asked, whether he would be baptized, an that thrice; for whom the sureties answer, that he would. I hear in some citie in* Italy, *that the old custome, for a great part is yet preserved.*

*Sacro baptisterio admovebatur.

§. 14. The Argument from *Heb.* 6. 2. for Infant-baptisme examined.

SEventhly, *Heb.* 6. 2. the Apostle speaks of the doctrine of baptismes, an laying on of hands; now this is not likely to be understood of laying o of hands in healing sick persons, or bestowing the Holy Ghost, for thes were extraordinary or miraculous, and therefore not to be put in the num ber of the principles of the oracles of God, the foundation, milk for babes nor of imposition of hands for Ordination to special function in the church for that, though ordinary, yet not likely to be put among the principles the foundation, milk for babes, therefore it remains, that it was the layin on of hands on children formerly baptized in infancy, which though cor ruptly made a Sacrament by *Papists*, and superstitiously abused, yet bein freed from the abuse were very usefull, as being an Apostolicall ordinance from this Text, and manifests that there was Infant-baptisme in the Apo stles dayes, which is confirmed, because it is coupled with baptisme, an therefore seems to be a consequent upon it.

Answ. 1. There is great incertainty, what this imposition of hands men tioned, *Heb.* 6. 2. served for, the reason to prove that it could not be eithe for healing, or giving the Holy Ghost, because they were miraculous or ex traordinary, is not cogent; for though they were by more then ordinar power, yet were they frequent in those times, and might well be put amon the elements to be in those days first learned: nor is the reason cogent t prove it could not be the imposition of hands in ordination, for special function in the Church; for it is more likely that it should be meant, whic it is certain was still in use, and to continue to be used, and therefore it wa needfull to be taught younglings, as well as the doctrine of baptismes then laying on of hands for confirmation of baptisme, of which ther is no certainty (though pretended examples) in Scripture, be brought t give some colour to it; nor is imposition of hands in ordination unfitly cou pled to baptisme, both being ordinances for initiation, the one into the pro fession of Christ, the other into sacred function.

2. Bu

2. But if it were ſuppoſed that this impoſition of hands, meant *Heb.6.2.* were on the baptized; yet this proves not the baptiſme of Infants in the Apoſtles dayes, unleſſe it could be proved that it was uſed after the baptiſme of Infants only, for a confirmation either of the baptiſme, or baptized. On the contrary, it is apparent out of *Tertul.de corona militis, c.3.* that in the primitive times the baptized did make his confeſſion at baptiſme, *ſub manu antiſtitis*, that is, the Miniſter laying hands on him. And to ſave labour in reciting teſtimonies, *Chamier* may be ſeen, who in his *Panſ.Catholica,tom.4.l.4. c.11.ſec.14.*at large proves out of the Ancients, that the impoſition of hands, which after was made a diſtinct Sacrament, called Confirmation, was either a part or appendix of Baptiſme: and many paſſages he cites to ſhew, that it was when the baptized was to confeſſe the faith, and to renounce Satan. And if *Hierom, tom. 2.* in his Dialogue againſt the *Luciferians*, do aſſert that uſe of Impoſition of hands from Scripture, yet he alleadgeth not *Heb.6.2.* for it, but the examples of giving the Holy Ghoſt by laying on of hands, in the *Acts of the Apoſtles.*

THe ſecond Argument followeth:

That which agreeth not with the Lords inſtitution of Baptiſme, that is deſervedly doubtfull.

But the rite of Infant-Baptiſme agrees not with the Lords inſtitution of Baptiſme, *Ergo.*

The *Major* is proved, becauſe Inſtitution is the rule of exhibiting worſhip to God.

The *Minor* is proved from the words of Inſtitution, *Mat.28.19. Going therefore, diſciple ye all nations, baptizing them.*

Whence I gather thus:

That rite agrees not with the Lords inſtitution of Baptiſme, according to which they are baptized, whom the Lord appointed not to be baptized.

But after the rite of Infant-Baptiſme, they are baptized whom the Lord appointed not to be baptized, *Ergo.*

The *Major* is manifeſt of it ſelf.

The *Minor* is proved: The Lord appointed not Infants to be baptized, *Ergo.* The Antecedent is proved;

Thoſe, and no other, the Lord appointed to be baptized, who have been made diſciples.

Arg. 2. §.15. The argument from the inſtitution of Chriſt, *Mat.*28 19. againſt Infant-baptiſme, confirmed.

But this cannot be said of Infants. *Ergo.*

The argument is confirmed from *John* 4. 2 where it is said that *Jesus made more disciples, then, that he baptized:* first it is said that he made disciples, then baptized.

Some one perhaps will say that Baptisme of Infants is elsewhere instituted, although not here.

To which is answered, Let he that can, bring forth that institution, and the doubt will be loosed.

But infants may be disciples, for they may be sanctified by the Spirit?

Answ. It is true, Infants may be sanctified by the Spirit of God, purged by the blood of Christ, saved by the grace of God, my minde abhorrs from the doctrine of them that assert, that Infants not baptized, necessarily perish, or are deprived of the Kingdome of God, nor do I doubt, but that the Elect Infants dying in infancy are sanctified, yea if it should be made known to us that they are sanctified, I should not doubt that they are to be baptized, remembring the saying of *Peter*, *Act.* 10. 47. *Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, who have received the Holy Ghost as we?*

Then you will say [make disciples] in that place, may be so expounded, as that it may include infants?

Answ. It follows not; but this only follows, that in case extraordinary, we may depart from the ordinary rule: But the ordinary rule is, make disciples, that is, by preaching the Gospell, make disciples, as appears from *Mark.* 16. 15. and baptize them, to wit, whom you have made disciples and in the ordinary course of ministry, we must follow the ordinary rule.

Perhaps some one will except, that Christ teacheth that such disciples should be baptized, but that the speech is not exclusive.

Refut. But it is meet he remember, who shall thus except, if institution be the rule of worship, it is necessary that he that shall administer the worship, binde himself to the rule, otherwise he will devise will-worship, and arrogate the Lords authority to himself: Surely the Apostle in the businesse of the Lords Supper, insinuates this, when being about to correct the aberrations of the *Corinthians*, concerning the Lords Supper he brings forth these words, 1 *Cor.* 11. 23. *For I have received of the Lord, that which I also have delivered unto you.*

Besides as Christ *Mat.* 19. 4. 8. argues from the institution of Marriage,

Marriage, against Divorce for a light cause, and Polygamie, because it is said, Two, not more then two shall be one flesh; so in like manner it may be here argued, Christ said Baptizing them, and not others, therefore these and not others are to be baptized.

But as for him who gathers from this place, infants are to be baptized, because Christ commands all Nations to be baptized, verily he is faulty. 1. In casting away that restriction that Christ hath put.

2. By determining that all men whatsoever are to be baptized, so that this is not a priviledge of believers and their children, but common with them, to all Infidels and their children.

And in very deed, however assertors of Infant-baptisme, crack of a priviledge of believers and their off-spring, not only the usuall practise of baptising any little children offered, but also sayings prove, that men have gone far, not only from Christs institution, but also from the principles, upon which, men at this day are busie to establish Infant-baptisme. I shall prove this by some instances. In the 59. Epistle of *Cyprian* to *Fidus*, from which *Augustine* is wont in his disputations against the *Pelagians*, to take his proof for Infant-baptisme, and to which Writers attribute much, although that I may say no worse, without cause, this reason is put, why it was not assented to Bishop *Fidus*, who thought that an Infant was not to be baptized, afore the eighth day, according to the Law of ancient Circumcision, *We all rather judged, that the mercy and grace of God is to be denied to none, that is born of men.*

By the answer of *Augustine* to *Bonifacius*, *Tom.* 2. *Epist.*23. Enquiring concerning the truth of Sureties, in affirming the unknowne faith of little ones, and promising for them, it will appeare to the Reader, that the baptisme of any little ones offered to baptisme, is defended by him, *Although they were not brought, that they might be regenerated to eternall Life, by Spirituall grace, but because they thinke by this remedy* (I use the words of *Augustine*) *to retain or receive temporall health*: *John Gerhard, Loc. Theolog. Tom.*4 *de Baptis. Cap.* 7. *Sect.*4. defends the practise of the Ancients baptizing the Children of unbeleevers: And the words of Mr. *Samuell Rutherford, Scot*, in his Booke lately put forth in the *English* tongue, intituled A peaceable and temperate plea, *c.*12. *arg.* 7. seems to me to prepend too much to this opinion, The words are these, *If then the Jewes in* Pauls *time were holy by Covenant,*

howbeit for the present the Sons were branches broken off, for unbelief, much more seeing God hath chosen the race and nation of the Gentiles, and is become a God to us and to our seed, the seed must be holy, with holinesse of the chosen nation, and holinesse externall of the Covenant, notwithstanding the Father and Mother were as wicked as the Jews, who slew the Lord of glory.

And the grave confutation of *Brownists*, by *Rathband*, *Part.* 3. *Pag.*50. *Fourthly, Children may be lawfully admitted to Baptisme, though both their Parents be profane, if those who are instead of Parents to them do require Baptisme for them, and give their promise to the Church for their religious Education, seeing they may lawfully be accounted within Gods Covenant, if any of their Ancestors in any Generation were faithfull.* Exod. 20. 5.

Lastly, if this Argument be not of force, Christ commandeth first to Disciple, and then to baptize those that are Discipuled; to exclude Infants from Baptisme; neither will the argument be of force, from 1 *Cor.*11.28. *Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat*, to exclude infants from the Lords Supper, for by the like elusion this argument may be rejected by saying, that the speech of the Apostle is not exclusive, and is to be understood of receiving the Lords Supper by persons grown only, yea, verily, neither will the argument be of force from the institution of the Supper, *Mat.*26.26,27. therefore only believers are to be admitted to the Lords Supper. If any reply. But the Apostle 1 *Cor.*10,& 11. hath declared, that the institution is exclusive, the same may be said of the institution of Baptism, from the following Argument.

Arg. 3. § 16. The argument from *John Baptist* and the Apostles practise against Infant-baptism confirmed.

THE third Argument is taken from the practise of the Apostles and *John Baptist*, which is the best interpreter of our Lords institution, from whence the Argument is thus formed:

That tenet and practise, which being put: Baptisme cannot be administred as *John Baptist* and the Apostles did administer it, agrees not with the practise of *John Baptist* and the Apostles.

But the tenet and practise of Infant-baptisme being put; Baptism cannot be administred, as *John Baptist* and the Apostles administred it, *Ergo.*

The *Major* is of it self manifest.

The *Minor* is proved; Before the Baptisme of *John* even the Jews did confesse sins, the Apostles before baptisme did require

shews

shews of faith and repentance, but this cannot be done in the baptisme of Infants: The *Major* is proved by looking on these places, *Mat.*3.6. *Luk.*3.10. *Act.*2.38. *Act.*8.12,13. and *ver.*37. when the *Eunuch* had said to *Philip*, *What letteth me to be baptized? Philip* answered, *If thou believest with thy whole heart thou maist*; he implies the defect of faith to be an impediment of Baptisme, *Act.*9.18. *Act.*20.47. *Act.*11.17,18. *Act.*16 15,31,32,33. *Act.*18.8. *Act.* 19.5. *Act.*22.16.

This Argument is confirmed, for if it be rightly argued from 1 *Cor.*11.28 That the Lords Supper is not to be granted to Infants, because self-examination is pre-required, by like reason we may say Baptisme is not to be yeelded to infants, because repentance and faith are pre-required, *Act.* 2.38. *Act.* 8. 37. and that of those who are descended from *Abraham*, and to whom the promise was.

*Arg.*4. §.17. The argument from the practise in the Age next the Apostles against Infant-baptism confirmed.

THE fourth Argument is taken from the practise of the next Age after the Apostles.

That tenet and practise is doubtfull of which it cannot be proved that it was in force or use, in the next Age after the Apostles.

But it cannot be proved that the tenet or practise of Infant-baptisme was in force or use in the Age next after the Apostles, *Ergo.*

The *Major* is of it self manifest.

The *Minor* is proved by the testimony of *Lodovicus Vives* above recited, to which *Vossius in thesibus Historico-Theologicis*, of Infant-baptisme, joynes the testimony of *Walafridus Strabo*, and by the examining of places brought to that purpose, and by the continuation of questions propounded to the baptized in Ages following, and other tokens from Councils and Ecclesiasticall writers, which in Historicall businesse are wont to beget credit.

The words of *Walafridus Strabo*, who lived about the year 840. in his book *de rebus Ecclesiasticis*, *Chap.* 26. are these, We are also to note, that in the first times the grace of Baptisme was wont only to be given to them, who by integrity both of body and minde were already come to this, that they could know and understand what profit is to be obtained in baptisme, what is to be confessed and believed, what lastly, is to be observed of them that are born again in Christ.

Arg. 4. § 17. The argument from the wrong originall of Infant-baptism, confirmed against it.

THe fifth Argument:

That which in succeeding Ages, in which it was in use, was in force, 1. as a Tradition not written; 2. Out of imitation of Jewish Circumcision; 3. Without universall practise; 4. Together with the error of giving Infants the Lords supper, and many other humane inventions, under the name of Apostolicall traditions; That is deservedly doubtfull.

But in some ages after the first from the Apostles, the tenet and practise of Infant-Baptisme was in use, 1. as a tradition not written, as appears from *Origen*, *Hom.* on *Rom.* 6. Of which book nevertheless let me add the censure of *Erasmus* on the Homilies of *Origen* upon *Leviticus*, *But he that reads this work, and the enarration of the Epistle to the Romans, is uncertain whether he read* Origen *or* Rufinus. And the testimony fetched from these books for Infant-Baptisme, is so much the more to be suspected, because *Augustine*, *Hierom*, *&c.* rely (so far as yet is manifest to me) on no other testimony, then of *Cyprian* and his fellow-Bishops in the Councel, of which mention is made *Epist.* 59. *ad Fidum.*

Secondly, out of imitation of Jewish circumcision, as the doubt of *Fidus*, in the 59. Epistle of *Cyprian* to *Fidus*, intimates, though there were also other reasons of Infant-baptisme; as the opinion of the necessity of Baptisme to salvation, and the greedinesse to increase the number of Christians, and perhaps the imitation of heathenish lustration of little ones; and some other.

Thirdly, without universall practise: for it is manifest that *Constantine*, although born of *Helena* his mother, a Christian, was not baptized till aged, as *Eusebius* in the life of *Constantine* written by him. The same is manifest from the book of Confessions of *Augustine*, concerning *Augustine* himself, whose mother *Monica* was a Christian. The things which may be drawn out of *Theodoret*, *Augustine*, and others, concerning *Theodosius*, *Alipius*, *Adeodatus*, and many others (although my books and notes out of them are wanting to me, by reason of the injury of the times) unlesse I be deceived will evince that (though in the Churches of those times, little ones were baptized, yet) many were not baptized, whose baptism its likely the Church would sooner have dispatched, if the opinion of Baptism that now obtains, had then obtained.

Fourthly, together with the error of giving the Lords supper to Infants, as is manifest out of the book of *Cyprian de lapsis*, and others.

thers. And that many other Inventions of men under the name of Apoſtolicall tradition, out of a wrong liking of Judaiſme, did then prevaile, as the *Paſchall ſolemnity, &c.* is ſo obvious to him that reads Fathers and Eccleſiaſticall writers, that no man will need proofe, *Ergo.*

And in very deed, as of old, becauſe the rite of Infant-baptiſme ſeemed to be of ſo great moment againſt the Pelagian hereſie, and for the authority of the Councell under *Cyprian*, the Councel of *Milevis*, *Auguſtine*, *Hierom*, and others, rather then from any ſolid argument out of Scripture, in former ages, Infant-baptiſme prevailed; ſo in this laſt age, ſome modern men ſeem to imbrace this tenet of Infant-baptiſm, out of horror of mind, leſt they ſhould go headlong into the pernicious errors of former Anabaptiſts, and their mad furies, or leſt they ſhould ſeem to deſert the leading men of the Reformed Churches, or move troubles in the Church; rather then from perſpicuous foundation in the Scriptures. Which they will think that I have not ſaid as one that dreams, who ſhall read what *Robert* Lord *Brook* hath in the end of his Treatiſe concerning Epiſcopacie, *Daniel Rogers* in his treatiſe of Baptiſme, and others elſwhere.

THe ſixth Argument follows:

Arg. 6. §. 19. The argument againſt Infant-baptiſme, from humane inventions occaſioned by it confirmed.

That which hath occaſioned many humane inventions, partly by which Infant-baptiſme it ſelf may be under-propped, partly the defect in the policy of the Church, which in very deed is to be ſupplied by the lawfull uſe of Baptiſme, Of that it is deſervedly doubtfull whether it be not in it ſelf weak and inſufficient for its proper work.

But the matter is ſo in the buſineſſe of Infant-baptiſme, *Ergo.*

The *Minor* is proved by inſtances: they are,

1. The uſe of ſureties in Baptiſme, which is an humane invention, for a ſhadowy ſupplement, and I had almoſt ſaid ſporting, of that profeſſion of faith which at firſt was made by the baptized in his own perſon.

2. Epiſcopall confirmation, in which the Biſhop layes hands or anoints the catechized, that Baptiſme, or the baptized may be confirmed, and they made capable of the Lords ſupper.

3. The reformed union, by examination, confeſſion, ſubſcription, of the received doctrine in the Church, before the communion of the

the Eucharist, of which *Parker* of *Eccles. policie, l.3. c.16.*

4. The Church-covenant, as they call it, afore the admission of members into Church-fellowship, of which the *New-England* Elders in the little book in English, called *Church-Covenant*, which in very deed are devised to supply the place of Baptisme; for by Baptisme, according to Christs institution, a person is exhibited a member of Christ and the Church, 1 *Cor.*12.13. *Gal.*3 27. *Ephes.*4.5.

Arg. 7. §.20. The argument against Infant-baptism, from the Errors occasioned by it, confirmed.

THe seventh Argument:

That which hath occasioned many errors, that is deservedly doubtfull, whether it be right.

But the practise of Infant-baptisme hath occasioned either the birth or fostering of many errors; *Ergo.*

It is proved by instances:

1. That Baptisme conferres grace by the work done.
2. That Baptisme is Regeneration.
3. That Infants dying, are saved by the faith of their parents, faith of sureties, of the Church receiving into her lap: which is to be ascribed alone to the grace of God by Christ.
4. That some regenerate persons may utterly fall from grace.

Arg. 8. §.21. The argument against Infant-baptism, from many abuses caused by it, confirmed.

THe eighth Argument:

That which hath caused many abuses and faults in Discipline, and Divine worship, and Conversation of men, that is deservedly doubtfull.

But Infant-Baptisme is such, *Ergo.*

It is proved by enumeration.

1. Private baptisme.
2. Baptisme by women.
3. Baptisme of Infants not yet brought into light.
4. Baptisme of Infants of uncertain progeny, whom we call children of the earth and world.
5. They are baptized in the name of the Lord, who know not the Lord, nor have ever consented, or perhaps will consent to the confession of the name of our Lord.
6. It hath brought in the admission of ignorant and profane men into the communion of the Church, and to the Lords supper: for who can deny rightly, the right of the Church to the baptized?

7. It

7. It perverts the order of diſcipline, that firſt a man be baptized and after among the catechized.

8. The Sacrament of baptiſme is turned into a meer Ceremony, yea into a profane meeting to feaſt together.

9. Men forget Baptiſme, as if they were never baptized, ſo that it hath the force of a carnall rite, not of a ſpirituall Inſtitution.

10. It takes away, or at leaſt diminiſheth zeale, and induſtry in knowing the Goſpel.

Arg.9. §.22. The argument from unneceſſary diſputes cauſed by it againſt Infant-baptiſme, confirmed.

THE *ninth* Argument.

That is deſervedly doubtfull, that yeeldeth occaſion to many unneceſſary diſputes, foſtering only contention, and which cannot be determined by any certain rule.

But the tenet or rite of Infant-baptiſme is ſuch,

Ergo.

It is proved by inſtances.

1. Of baptizing the Infants of Excommunicated perſons.

2. Of baptizing the Infants of Apoſtates.

3. Of baptizing the Infants of ſuch Parents as are not members in a gathered Church.

4. Of baptizing the Infants of thoſe, whoſe Anceſtors were believers, the next Parents remaining in unbelief; Theſe things ſhew that men have departed from the Rule, when they know not where to ſtay.

Arg.10. § 23. The argument againſt Infant-baptiſm from the oppoſition to it in the middeſt of Popery, confirmed.

THE tenth reaſon of doubting is,

That in the midſt of the darkneſſe under the Papacy the ſame men oppoſed Infant-baptiſme, who oppoſed invocation of Saints, prayer for the dead, adoration of the Croſſe, and ſuch like; This is manifeſt out of the 66. Sermon of *Bernard*, on the *Canticles*, where of the Heretiques (as he cals them) who he ſaid boaſted themſelves to be Succeſſors of the Apoſtles, and name themſelves Apoſtolique, he hath theſe words, *They deride us, becauſe we baptize Infants, becauſe we pray for the dead, becauſe we ask the ſuffrages of the Saints*, and in his 140 Epiſtle to *Hildefonſus*, Earl of Saint *Giles*, he complains of *Henricus* the Heretique, formerly a Monke, that *He tooke away holydayes, Sacraments, Churches, Prieſts, that the life of Chriſt is ſtopped to the little ones of Chriſtians, while the grace of Baptiſme is denied, and they are not ſuffered to draw neer to ſalvation.*

From the Epistle of *Peter Abbat. Cluniacensis,* to three Bishops of *France,* against *Peter de Bruis,* and *Henricus,* holding errors, digested into five heads.

1. *That little ones are not to be baptized.*

2. *That Churches or Altars ought not to be made.*

3. *That the Crosse of our Lord is not to be adored or Worshipped, but rather to be broken and trodden under feet.*

4. *That the Masse is nothing, nor ought to be celebrated.*

5. *That the good deeds of the living, nothing profit the dead; That we are not to chaunt to God.* He saith, that the heresie of the *Petrobrusians* was received in the Cities of *Gallia Narbonensis.*

And from *Lucas Osiander* his Epitome of the Ecclesiasticall History, *Cent.*13 *l.*1.*c.*4. at the year 1207. where he accuseth the *Albigenses* as consenting with the *Anabaptists.*

To which I adde, That in the ages neer the Apostles, *Tertullian* and *Gregory Nazianzen* dissware the baptisme of Infants, unless the danger of death happen. The words of *Tertullian* are in his book of Baptisme, *c.*18. *Therefore for the condition and disposition, also age of each person, the delaying of Baptisme is more profitable: Yet chiefly about little ones; for What need that the Sureties be also cast on danger, who themselves may by mortality be wanting to their promises, and be deceived by the comming forth of an evill disposition. The Lord saith indeed, Do not prohibite them to come to me; let them come when they are grown, let them come when they learn, let them be taught when they come, let them be made Christians when they can know Christ. Why doth innocent age hasten to the remission of sinnes? shall it be done more warily in things secular, that to whom earthly substance is not committed, divine should? Let them know how to ask safety, that thou maist know to give to him that asketh.*

Gregory Nazianzen, in his 40. Oration of holy Baptisme:

For which we are to use all diligence, that We misse not the common grace. Some one will say, let these things be concerning them that seek Baptisme: but What may you say concerning them that are yet babes, and neither perceive losse, nor grace? shall we also baptize them? Yes by all means, if any danger urge; for it is better that they be sanctified Without perceiving it, then to go away unsealed or unaccomplished. And the reason of this, to us, is Circumcision on the eighth day, being a certain typical seal, & offered to them that had not yet the use of reason; as also the anointing of the posts, which by things without feeling preserved

served the first born. But for others, I give my opinion that they stay three yeares, or a little within this, or beyond it, when they may be able to heare and answer some mysticall points, if they cannot understand perfectly, yet being thus stamped, they shall sanctifie both soules and bodies with the great mystery of consecration.

THe eleventh reason of doubting, is, Because the Assertors of Infant-Baptisme little agree among themselves, upon what foundation they may build Infant-Baptisme. *Cyprian* and others of the Ancients draw it from the universality of divine grace, and the necessity of Baptisme to salvation. *Augustine, Bernard,* and others, bring the faith of the Church as the reason of baptizing Infants: Others, among whom is the Catechisme in the English Liturgie, put as the reason of Infant-Baptisme, the promise of the Sureties, in the place of the faith and repentance of the baptized. The Lutherans, the faith of the Infant; others, the holinesse of a believing Nation; others, the faith of the next parent; others, the faith of the next parent in covenant in a gathered Church. This difference of the maintainers of Infant-Baptism, deservedly causeth doubt concerning the thing it self.

Arg. 11. §. 24. The Argument against Infant-baptism, from assertors difference about the ground of it, confirmed.

THE last, and that a weighty reason of doubting is, because Infant-Baptisme seemes to take away one, perhaps the primary end of Baptism; for many things argue that it was one end of Baptism, that it should be a signe that the baptized shews himself a disciple, and confesseth the faith in which he hath been instructed.

Arg. 12. §. 25. The Argument against Infant-baptism, from its voyding the chief end of Baptism, confirmed.

1. The requiring of confession by *John Baptist* and the Apostles, was wont to be before Baptisme, *Luk.*3.10. *Act.*8.35. *Act.*16.31.

2. The frequent manner of speaking in the new Testament, which puts Baptism for Doctrine, *Act.*10.37. *Act.*19.3. shews this. *Beza* in his Annot. on *Act.*19.3. *The answer is most apposite, in which they signifie that they professed in Baptism the doctrine propounded by* John, *and confirmed by use of Baptisme with which they had been baptized, whereby they had acknowledged Christ but very slenderly.*

3. The form of Christs institution, *Mat.* 28. 19. compared with the phrase as it is used 1 *Cor.*1.13. Or, *were you baptized into the name of Paul?* implies the same. On which place *Beza*,

The third reason is taken from the form and end of Baptisme, in which we give our name to Christ, being called upon, with the Father and Holy Spirit.

4. That which is said, *Joh.* 4. 2. *He made and baptized more disciples.* And *Mat.* 28. 19. *Going, make disciples in all nations, baptizing them*; Intimate this. And if, as some affirme, Baptism was in use with the Jews, in the initiating of proselytes into the profession of Judaisme; this opinion is the more confirmed. But in Infant-Baptisme the matter is so carried, that Baptisme serves to confirm a benefit, not to signifie a profession made: and so one, perhaps the chief end of Baptisme is voyded. And here I think it is to be minded, that the usuall description of a Sacrament, and such as are like to it, That it is a *visible signe of invisible grace*; hath occasioned the misunderstanding of both Sacraments, as if they signed a divine benefit, not our duty, to which in the first place the Institution had respect.

It seems to some, that Infant-baptisme should be good, because the Devil requires Witches to renounce it. Which reason, if ought worth, might as well prove Baptisme of any Infants, Baptisme by a Midwife, good; because these the Devil requires them to renounce, as well that which is of the Infants of believers, by a lawfull Minister. But the true reason why he requires the Baptisme of Witches to be renounced by them, is not because the Baptisme is good in respect of the administration of it, but because the Faith mentioned in the form of Baptisme, is good; and they that renounce not their baptisme, do shew their adherence to that faith in some sort, which cannot stand with an explicite covenant with the Devil. Nor is the assuming of baptisme in ripe yeares by those who were washed in infancy, a renouncing of baptisme, as some in their grosse ignorance conceit; but indeed a firmer avouching of baptisme according to Christs mind.

This more likely might be inferred from the Devils practise in requiring Witches to renounce their baptisme; That the profession of Faith is the main businesse in Baptisme, which should be before Baptisme, if it were rightly administred after the first pattern.

FINIS.

An Examen
OF THE
SERMON

Of Mr. Stephen Marshal, About *Infant-Baptiſme*, in a Letter ſent to him:

Divided into Foure Parts.

1. *Concerning the Antiquity of Infant-baptiſme.*
2. *Concerning the prejudices againſt Antipædobaptiſts from their miſcarriages.*
3. *Concerning the Arguments from Scripture, for Infant-baptiſme.*
4. *Concerning the Objections againſt Infant-baptiſme.*

In which are maintained theſe Poſitions.

1. *Infant-baptiſme is not ſo ancient as is pretended, but as now taught is a late Innovation.*
2. *Antipædobaptiſme hath no ill influence on Church, or Common-wealth.*
3. *Infant-baptiſme cannot be deduced from Holy Scripture.*
4. *Infant-baptiſme is a corruption of the Ordinance of Baptiſme.*

LONDON,
Printed by *R. W.* for *George Whitington.* 1645.

Infant-Baptiſme
Is not ſo Ancient as is pretended:
As now Taught, Is a late Innovation.

PART I.

Concerning the antiquity of Infant-Baptiſme.

SIR,

§. 1. The prologue Of the occaſion, and end of this writing.

IT is now full nine moneths ſince, that being informed by one of the Members of the Aſſembly, in which you are one, that there was a Committee choſen out of the Members of the Aſſembly, to give ſatisfaction in the point of Pædobaptiſme, and adviſed by the ſame perſon out of his tender love to me, to preſent the reaſons of my doubts about Pædo-baptiſme, to that Committee; I drew them up in Latine, in nine Arguments, in a ſcholaſtique way, and they were delivered unto Mr. *Whitaker* the Chair-man of the Committee, about nine moneths ſince: to which I added after, an addition of three more reaſons of doubting, with a ſupplement of ſome other things wanting; which was delivered to Mr. *Tuckney*, and joyned by him to the former Papers. My aim therein was, either to find better ground then I had then found to practiſe the baptizing of Infants, from that Aſſembly of learned and holy men, whom I ſuppoſed able and willing

ling to resolve their Brother in the Ministery; Or else according to the solemn Covenant I have taken, to endeavour the reformation of these Churches according to Gods word, by informing that Assembly what I conceived amisse in the great ordinance of Baptizing. The successe was such, as I little expected: to this day I have heard nothing from the Committee by way of answer to those doubts; but I have met with many Pamphlets, and some Sermons, tending to make the questioning of that point odious to the People, and to the Magistracie. Among others, reading the Sermon of Mr. *Richard Vines*, on *Ephes.* 4. 14. before the Lord Major: and the Sermon you preached at *Westminster Abbey*. I perceive there is such a prejudice in you, and it may seem by the Vote passed about the members of the visible Church, in the generality of the Assembly, that he is likely to be exploded, if not censured, that shall but dispute against it: and therefore little or no likelihood that this matter will be argued, as I conceive it doth deserve, in your Assembly. And further, I perceive there is a great zeale in your spirit against the denying of Children baptisme, as if it were a more cruell thing than *Hazaels* dashing out Childrens brains; That it were an exclusion of them out of the Covenant of Grace, &c. Which I the more admire, considering the report which hath been of you, as a sober, learned, holy, well-tempered man, that you should be so transported in this matter, as to be so vehement in maintaining that which was accounted heretofore in many ages, but an Ecclesiasticall tradition, for which you are fain to fetch a command from Circumcision, and confesse no expresse example in Scripture for it: and go not about to prove it, but by consequence inferr'd from five Conclusions, which though you call undeniable, yet others do not think so, nor yet see reason to subscribe to your judgment. You are not ignorant, I presume, that Mr. *Daniel Rogers*, in his Treatise of the Sacrament of Baptisme, *part* 1. *pag.* 79. confessed himself *yet unconvinced by demonstration of Scripture for it.* And whereas your *Achilles* for Pædo-baptisme, is the Circumcision of Infants, me thinks Mr. *Balls* words, (Reply to the Answer of the *New-England* Elders, about the third and fourth Positions, *pag.* 38, 39.) cut the sinews of that argument. *But in whatsoever they agree, or differ, We must look to the Institution, and neither stretch it wider, nor draw it narrower then the Lord hath made it; For he is the Institutor of the Sacraments according to his own good pleasure; and it is our part to learn of him, both to whom, how, and for what end the Sacraments are to be admi-*

administred; how they agree, and wherein they differ. In all which we must affirm nothing, but what God hath taught us, and as he hath taught us. And whereas the words of *Paul*, 1 Cor. 7. 14. are your principall strength to prove the Covenant-holines of Infants of a believing parent, *Musculus* a writer of good esteem, in his Commentary upon that place confesseth, that he had abused formerly that place against the Anabaptists, but found it impertinent to that purpose. And for my part, after most carefull and serious reading and perusing of many Authors, and among the rest, your Sermon, I cannot yet find it to be any other then an innovation, in comparison of many other things rejected late, maintained by erroneous and dangerous principles, having no true ground from Christs institution, which alone can acquit it from Will-worship, and which hath occasioned many errors in doctrine, corruptions in discipline and manners, unnecessary and vain disputes, and almost quite changed the ordinance of Baptisme. Wherefore, upon advise, I have resolved to examine your Sermon, who are a leading man, and in respect of your eminency, either likely to be a very good, or very bad instrument, as you are guided; that you may either rectifie me, or I you; and that we may (if the Lord shall see it good) give one another the right hand of fellowship, and stand fast in one mind in the truth of the Gospel, and cleare the truth of God to the people, whose eyes are upon us. And so much the rather have I pitched upon your Sermon, because I conceive it contains in a plain way as much as can be wel said for Pœdobaptisme; and your Epistle seems to intimate your publishing of it to be for the ease of the Assembly, and possibly it may be all I may expect from them. Now the Lord vouchsafe to frame both your spirit and mine, that we may seek and find truth, in humility and love, in this great businesse, which concerns the soules, & perhaps lives and estates of many millions, yea of all godly persons; and the glory of God, and honour of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that we may trample under our feet our own credit, our own opinion, if it stand not with the honour of Christ, and the truth of God.

§. 2. Of the stating the question, partition of the Treatise, sum of the Answer to the Testimonies of Antiquity for Infant-baptisme.

LEtting passe the Epistle, and leaving the various Questions, and allowing the stating of the Question, conceiving you mean it of baptizing by warrant of ordinary rule of Scripture, without extraordinary revelation or direction. Whereas you affirme, *that the Infants of Believers are to be baptized with Christs baptisme, by*

the lawfull Miniſter according to ordinary rule.

I deny it.

That which you ſay for the practiſe of baptizing infants may be reduced, 1. To the teſtimonies of Antiquity. 2. To the novelties and miſcarriages of the oppoſers of it. 3. To the arguments produced for it. 4. To the anſwering objections againſt it. I ſhall by Gods aſſiſtence examine each of theſe. Firſt you affirm, *That the Chriſtian Church hath been in poſſeſſion of it for the ſpace of fifteen hundred years and upwards, as is manifeſt out of moſt of the Records that wee have of Antiquity both in the Greek and Latine Churches.*

To this I anſwer, that if it were true, yet it is not ſo much as may be ſaid for Epiſcopacy, keeping of Eaſter, the religious uſe of the Croſſe, &c. which I conceive you reject. 2. That the higheſt teſtimonies you produce come not ſo high. 3. Thoſe that be alleaged, being judiciouſly weighed, will rather make againſt the preſent doctrine and practiſe, then for it. 4. There are many evidences that do as ſtrongly prove (as proofes uſually are taken in ſuch matters) *Quod ab initio non fuit ſic*, That from the beginning it was not ſo; and therefore it is but an innovation. The firſt of theſe I preſume you will acknowledge, that for Antiquity not-Apoſtolicall, there are plain teſtimonies of Epiſcopacy, keeping of Eaſter, the religious uſe of the Croſſe being in uſe, before any of the teſtimonies you, or any other can produce for baptizing of infants; and therefore I will forbear mentioning proofes ſo obvious to Schollars. The ſecond and third thing I ſhall make good in the weighing of the Teſtimonies you produce, and the fourth in the cloſe.

§. 3. Of the pretended Teſtimony of *Juſtine Martyr.*

YOur Teſtimonies are either of the Greek or Latine Churches. Of the Greekes you alleage foure. The firſt is *Juſtine Martyr*, of whom you ſay, *That he lived Anno* 150. *which wants ſomewhat of* 1500. *years; and therefore you did ſomewhat overlaſh, in ſaying that it is manifeſt out of moſt of the Records of the Greeke and Latine Church; The Church hath been in poſſeſſion of the priviledge of baptizing Infants* 1500. *years and upwards*; and then you ſay, *In a Treatiſe that goes under his name*: By which it is manifeſt, that you know that it was queſtioned whether it was his or no; and I conceive you could not be ignorant, that it is not only queſtioned, but alſo proved by *Perkins* in his [illegible] demonſtration of the Probleme, by *River* in his [illegible]

Cooke of *Leeds* (if my memory faile me not, to which I am inforced to truſt in many things, being ſpoiled of my bookes) in his Cenſure, and confeſſed by Papiſts, to be none of *Juſtine Martyrs*, but to bee written a great while after his dayes; for as much as it mentions not only *Irenæus*, but alſo *Origen* and the *Manichees*: Now what doth this baſtard Treatiſe ſay? You ſay *Queſtion* 56. Juſtine Martyr *diſputes the different condition of thoſe children who die baptized, and of thoſe children who die unbaptized.* The queſtion propounded is. *If Infants dying have neither praiſe nor blame by works, What is the difference in the reſurrection of thoſe that have been baptized by others, and have done nothing, and of thoſe that have not been baptized, and in like manner have done nothing. The Anſwer is, this is the difference of the baptized from the not baptized; that the baptized obtaine good things* (meaning at the Reſurrection) *by baptiſme, but the unbaptized obtain not good things. And they are accounted worthy of the good things they have by their baptiſme, by the faith of thoſe that bring them to baptiſme.* You may by this teſtimony ſee (what ever Age the book was made in) what the reaſon of baptizing of Infants was: Not the ſuppoſed Covenant of grace, made to believers and their ſeed, which you make the ground of baptizing of infants: but the opinion that the not baptized ſhould not obtain good things at the reſurrection (meaning the Kingdome of God, mentioned *Joh.* 3 5) but the baptized ſhould; and that by reaſon of the faith of the bringers, what ever the Parents were, and therefore they baptized the children of unbelievers, as well as believers if they were brought.

§. 4. Of *Irenæus* his Teſtimony.

YOur next Greek Author is *Irenæus*, who was indeed a Greeke, and wrote in Greek, but now only we have his works in Latine, (except ſome few fragments) for which reaſon we are not ſo certain of his meaning, as we might be if we had his own words in the language in which he wrote. You ſay *he lived in the ſame Century*, and it is acknowledged he lived in the ſame Century with *Juſtine Martyr* but not with the Author of the Queſtions & Anſwers *ad Orthodoxos*, who (as hath been ſaid) lived in ſome Age after. *Irenæus* is by *Uſher* placed at the yeare 180. by *Oſiander* at the yeare 183. ſo that though he were of that Century, yet he flouriſhed in the latter part of it, and ſo reacheth not to your 1500. years & upwards. Of him you ſay, that *l.2.c.39.* he ſaith *Chriſtus venit per ſeipsũ omnes ſalvare, omnes inquã, qui per eum renaſcuntur in Deũ, infantes & parvulos & pueros, &c.*

Now it is well knowne, ſay the Gloſſers upon that text, renaſcentiæ nomine, Dominica & Apoſtolica Phraſi Baptiſmum intelligi: You might have added what follows. *Aperte confirmans Apoſtolorum traditionem de baptiſmo infantium parvulorum adverſus Anabaptiſticam impietatem.* But I pray you, whoſe Gloſſe was this? Was it any other then *Fevardentius* (if I miſtake not) of whom *Rivet. Crit. Sacr. lib. 2 cap. 6. Juniores tantum, qui in opera Irenæi incident monitos volo, ut caveant ab illis Editionibus, quas impudentiſſimus ille Monachus Fevardentius, homo projectæ audaciæ et nullius fidei, fœde in multis corrupit, & annotationibus impiis et mendacibus conſpurcavit.* And for the gloſſe its falſe: for no where doth our Lord, or the Apoſtles call baptiſme, New birth, although our Lord ſpeake of being borne againe of water *Joh.* 3. 5. and *Paul* of the waſhing of regeneration. *Tit.* 3. 5. and for the words themſelves without the gloſſe, all the ſtrength lyes in this, that the word (*Renaſcuntur*) is uſed for Baptiſme by the Ancients, which yet poſſibly was not the word *Irenæus* uſed in his owne writing; and how the Latine tranſlation alters the meaning of *Irenæus*, you may ſee ſomewhat in *Rivet. Voſſius Theſibus Theologic. de Pædobapt. Theſi.* 7. intimates, *that the proper acception is of ſanctification, and that the word may be ſo taken*, yea and that it is not meant of Baptiſme, the words and the whole ſcope of *Irenæus* in that place ſhew. For the ſcope of *Irenæus* in that chapter is to refute the *Gnoſticks*, who ſayd that Chriſt did not exceede one and thirty yeeres of age; againſt whom *Irenæus* alleageth, that Chriſt lived in every age, of infancy, youth, old age, that by his age, & example, he might ſanctifie every age, ſo that here *Irenæus* ſpeakes not of being borne againe by Baptiſme: for it is ſaid, *who are borne againe by him*, that is, by Chriſt. Not as if he had baptized infants, but becauſe he was an infant, that by the example or vertue of his age, he might ſanctifie infants, as the whole context will ſhew, which is this. *Magiſter ergo exiſtens, Magiſtri quoque habebat ætatem, non reprobans nec ſupergrediens hominem, neque ſolvens ſuam legem in ſe humani generis, ſed omnem ætatem ſanctificans per illam, quæ ad ipſum erat, ſimilitudinem. Omnes enim venit per ſeipſum ſalvare, omnes inquam, qui per eum renaſcuntur in Deum, Infantes, & parvulos, & pueros, & juvenes & ſeniores. Ideo per omnem venit ætatem, & infantibus infans factus ſanctificans infantes, in parvulis parvulus, ſanctificans hanc ipſam habentes ætatem, ſimul & exemplum illis pietatis effectus & juſtitiæ, & ſubjectionis. In Juvenibus Juvenis exemplum Juvenibus fiens, &*

Sanctificans

Sanctificans Domino: sic et senior in senioribus, ut sit perfectus Magister, non solum secundum expositionem veritatis, sed secundum ætatem, sanctificans simul & seniores exemplum ipsis quoque fiens deinde & usque ad mortem pervenit, ut sit primogenitus ex mortuis ipse primatum tenens in omnibus princeps vitæ, prior omnium, et præcedens omnes. Which he confirmes by the testimony of *Iohn* the Apostle, from whom he saith, those that conversed with him related, that Christ lived about fifty yeares, which all sorts of writers doe reckon among *Irenæus* his blemishes, and thereby shew how little credit is to be given to the too much entertained Apostolicall traditions.

§. 5. Of the supposed testimony of *Origen*.

THe next Greeke Author is *Origen*, who you say lived in the beginning of the third Century, *Perkins* and *Vsher* place him at the yeare 230. but for his works, as of old they were counted full of errours and dangerous to be reade, so as now they are, we can hardly tell in some of them what is *Origens*, What not: for the originall being lost, we have only the Latine translation, which being performed in many of his works, and particularly the Homilies on *Leviticus*, and the Epistle to the *Romanes*, by *Ruffinus*, it appeares by his owne confession, that he added many things of his own, insomuch that *Erasmus* in his censure of the Homilies on *Leviticus* saith, *that a man cannot be certaine whether he readeth* Ruffinus *or* Origen; and *Perkins* puts among *Origens* Counterfeit works his Comentary on the Epistle to the *Romans*, as being not faithfull translated by *Ruffinus*: the like is the judgement of *Rivet* and others, and I suppose did you reade the passages themselves you cite, and consider how they are brought in: and how plaine the expressions are against the *Pelagians*: you would quickly conceive, that those passages were put in after the *Pelagian* heresie was confuted by *Hierom* and *Augustine*, who often tells us that the Fathers afore that controversie arose, did not speake plainly against the *Pelagiens*: and of all others, *Origen* is most taxed as *Pelagianizing*. Wherefore *Vossius* in the place aforenamed, though he cite him for company, yet addes, *sed de Origene minus laborabimus quia quæ citabamus, Græce non extant.* But what saith the supposed *Origen*? In one place, *that the Church received this tradition of baptizing infants from the Apostles*: in another *according to the observance of the Church, baptisme is granted to infants*, you adde, (as foreseeing that this passage would

Si igitur aliquis ante natum Pelagium vel ante exortum Arium in Pelagionorum & Arianorum errores acer et vehemens, eosque ex professo, quamvis Hereticorum nomine suppresso divexans, probabile non est tale Scriptum esse ejus Authoris cujus nomen præfert. Rivet. tractat de Patrum Authorit. cap 14.

prove that then it was held but a tradition) *that then the greatest points of faith were ordinarily called traditions, received from the Apostles*, and you cite 2 *Thes.* 2.15. To which I reply, true it is that they did call the greatest points of faith, though written, traditions Apostolicall, as conceiving they might best learne what to hold in points of faith, from the Bishops of those Churches where the Apostles preached, and therefore in prescriptions against Heretickes, *Tertullian, Irenaus* and others, direct persons to go to the Churches where the Apostles sate, specially the *Romane* Church which seemes to have beene the seed of Appeals to Rome, and the ground of the conceit which was had of the Popes unerring Chaire. But it is true also they called Apostolicall traditions any thing though unwritten, which was reported to have come from the Apostles; as the time of keeping *Easter*, and many more, which was the fountaine of all corruptions in discipline and worship. And that in those places you cite, is meant an unwritten tradition, not only the not citing any Scripture for Baptizing of Infants, but also the very Phrases, *Pro hoc et Ecclesia ab Apostolis traditionem suscepit & Secundum Ecclesiæ observantiam*, are sufficient proofe to them who are acquainted with the Ancients writings of those times. So that yet you have not proved that the baptisme of Infants was time out of minde, that it had beene received in the Church, or was delivered over to the Church in *Origens* time, and was of ancient use in the Church afore his time. But these passages prove that in the time when the framer of those passages wrote, it was accounted but an Apostolicall tradition, according to the observance of the Church. Like speeches to which are found in *Pseudo-Dyonisius* in the end of his Hierachy, and *Augustin. lib.* 10. *de Genesi ad literam. c.* 23. and elsewhere, which argue that it was held as an Ecclesiasticall tradition in those times.

Consuetudo tamen Matris Ecclesiæ in baptizandis parvulis nequaquam spernenda est, neque ullo modo superflua deputanda, nec omnino credenda nisi Apostolica esset traditio. Augustin. lib. 10. *cap.* 23. *de Genesi.*

§ 6. Of the Testimonies of *Gregory Nazianzen* and the Greeke Church.

THe fourth and last of the Greeke Church you name is *Gregory Nazianzen*, who is by *Perkins* placed at the yeare 380. by *Vsher* 370. much short of 1500. yeares and upwards, you say that *Orat.* 40. *in Baptismum, he calls baptisme, signaculum vitæ cursum in euntibus, and commands Children to be baptized, though afterwards he seemed to restraine it to the case of necessity.* But doth he seeme onely to restraine it to the case of necessity? the words are plaine, that he gives the reason why Infants in danger of death should be baptized ὥστε μὴ διαμάρτωσι τῆς κοινῆς χάριτος, *that they might not*

misse

misse of the common grace, but περὶ τῶν ἄλλων δίδωμι γνώμην, *he gives his opinion of others, that they should stay longer, that they might be instructed, and so their minds and bodyes might be Sanctified,* and these are all you bring of the Greek Church. By the examination of which you may perceive how well you have proved, *that it is manifest out of most of the Records that we have of antiquitie both in the Greeke and Latine Church, that the Christian Church hath beene in possession of the priviledge of baptizing the infants of beleivers for the space of* 1500. *yeares and upwards.* Whereas the highest is but a bastard Treatise, and yet comes not so high, if it were genuine; the next without a glosse, which agrees not with the text, speakes nothing to the purpose, the third is of very doubtfull credit, the fourth which was sundry hundreds of yeares after Christ restraines it to the case of necessity. But it is wonder to me, that if it were so manifest as you speake, you should finde nothing in *Eusebius* for it, nor in *Ignatius*, nor in *Clemens Alexandrinus*, nor in *Athanasius*, nor in *Epiphanius*, that I mention not others: to me it is no small argument that baptisme of Infants was not universally knowne in the Greek Church, no not in *Epiphanius* his dayes, who is said to flourish in the yeare 390. because in his *Panarium*, disputing against the *Hieracites*, that denied Infants inheriting the Kingdome of heaven, because not striving. *He brings the Infants killed by* Herod, *the words of the Lord concerning* Ieremiah *Chap.* 1. *of his propheſie*: *Christs blessing and receiving of infants, the children crying* Hosanna: *but nothing at all of Infants-baptisme*, which had beene as proper to his purpose if he had beene acquainted with it. But besides the continuance of the questions to baptized persons, and answered by them, in many Authors mentioned, this is to me, and it seemed so to *Hugo Grotius, Annot.* in *Matth.* 19. 14. No small evidence, that baptisme of Infants many hundred yeares was not ordainary in the Greeke Church: because not only *Constantine* the Great, though the sonne of *Helena* a zealous Christian as its reported, was not baptized till aged, but also that *Gregory Nazianzen* who was the sonne of a Christian Bishop, and brought up long by him, was not baptized till he came to be a youth, as is related in his life. And *Chrysostome* though (as *Grotius* saith) according to the vulgar opinion, borne of Christian Parents, and educated by *Meletius* a Bishop, yet was he not baptized till past 21 yeares of age. *Gratian* saith, that the Canon of the Synod of *Neocæsarea* held in the yeare 315. determines

Lib. 2. hæres. 47 vel. 67.

that

that a woman with childe might be baptized, because the baptisme reached not to the fruit of her wombe, because in the confession made in baptisme, each ones own free choice is shewed. From which Canon, *Balsamon* and *Zonaras* do inferre, that *an Infant cannot be baptized, because it hath not power to choose the confession of divine baptisme.* And *Grotius* adds further, that *many of the Greeks in every age unto this day do keep the custome of differing the baptisme of little ones, till they could themselves make a confession of their faith.* From all which I inferre, That the *Anabaptists need not blush to say* (which you seem to make a part of their impudence) *that the Ancients, especially the Greek Church, rejected the baptisme of Infants for many hundred yeeres.*

§. 7.
Of the testimony of *Cyprian,*

I Proceed to the Writers of the Latine Church, you alledge for Baptisme of Infants. First *Cyprian, one of the ancientest writers amongst the Latines:* which is true; He is placed by *Perkins* at the yeare 240. by *Usher*, at the yeare 250. Yet *Tertullian* was before him, and counted his master: Now in *Tertullians* time, *it appeares* (saith *Grotius* in Mat. 19. 14.) *there was nothing defined concerning the age in which they were to be baptized, that were consecrated by their parents to Christian discipline, because he dissuades by so many reasons (in his book of Baptism c. 18.) the baptizing of Infants.* And if he did allow it, it was only in case of necessity, as may appeare by his words in his book *de anima, c. 39.* But you say, *Cyprian handles it at large, in Epist. 59. ad Fidum.* It is true, he doth say enough in that Epistle for baptizing of Infants, and more then enough, except he had spoken to better purpose. The truth is, the very reading of that Epistle, upon which *Hierom*, and especially *Augustine* rely for the proving of the baptizing of Infants, is sufficient to discover how great darkenesse there was then upon the spirits of those that were counted the greatest lights in the Church. You say, *upon this occasion,* Fidus *denied not the baptisme of Infants, but denied that they ought to be baptized before the eighth day.* But you might have further observed, that *Fidus* alleadged, *considerandam esse legem Circumcisionis antiquæ,* that *he thought the law of ancient Circumcision was to be considered.* And, *Vestigium Infantis in primis partus sui diebus constituti mundum non esse dixisti: Thou hast said that the footstep of an Infant being in the first dayes of his birth, is not clean.* Whence it plainly appeares, that there was a relique of Judaisme in him, and that he did

did not well understand the abrogation of the Ceremoniall Law: and the truth is, the contentions about *Easter*, neere that age, do plainly shew, that Iudaisme was not quite weeded out of the mindes of the chiefe teachers among Christians. You say *Cyprian assures him, that by the unanimous consent of 66 Bishops gathered together in a Councell, baptisme was to be administred to Infantes, as well as to growne men; and not to be restrained to any time, which is true,* but you adde, *and proves it by such arguments as these. They are under originall sinne, they neede pardon, are capable of grace and mercy, God regards not age, &c.* But the resolution of *Cyprian* with his Collegues is not so lightly to be passed over, sith the determination of this Councell, as far as I can by search finde, is the very spring-head of Infant-baptisme. To conceive it aright, it is to be considered, that you are mistaken, about the proofe of their opinion; the things you mention, are not the proofe, but are produced in answer of objections. The proofe is but one, except you will make a proofe of that which is in the close of the Epistle, which is, *that whereas none is to be kept from baptisme, and the grace of God, much lesse New-borne Infants, who in this respect doe deserve more of our ayde, and Gods mercy, because in the beginning of their birth they presently crying and weeping doe nothing else but pray.* The onely proofe is this, *the mercy and grace of God is to be denyed to none, that are borne of man, for the Lord saith in the Gospell, that the sonne of man came not to destroy mens soules, but to save them, and therefore as much as in us lyes, if it may be, no soule is to be lost, and therefore all infants at all times to be baptized.* Whence we may observe: 1. That they thought baptizing, giving Gods grace, and the denying it, denying Gods grace: Secondly, that they thought the soules to be lost that were not baptized. Thirdly, that therefore not onely Infants of beleivers, but all infants were to be baptized. Whence *Tossanus* in his Synopsis, Notes this for *Cyprians* errour that he taught, *Infantes Statim esse baptizandos ne pereant, quod eis misericordia non sit deneganda Ep. 8. lib. 3.* Then follow the objections, which are three. First, *That Infants are not capable being so young:* this he answers by saying *God regards not age,* which he proves by an allegoricall accomodation of *Elisha,* his stretching himselfe upon the little Childe, to the applying of Gods grace to Infants. The second objection is, *But we shun to kisse Infantes as uncleane in the first dayes of their birth:*

to this he answers, *that to the cleane all things are cleane; and we ought not to decline the embracing Gods worke.* The third objection, *Was the Law of circumcision,* to this he answers, that *in Circumcision the eighth day was a figure of the resurrection of Christ: Which is now accomplished, and we are to account now nothing common or uncleane: and therefore we are not to account this an impedinent to obtaine grace by Baptisme.* Then he addes further, *if any thing could hinder from obtaining of grace, greater sinnes should hinder men of yeares from it, now if greater sinnes hinder not men of yeares from it, but that they when they beleive obtaine forgivenes, grace, and Baptisme, by how much rather is an Infant not to be forbidden, who being newly borne, hath not sinned, except in that being borne carnally according to* Adam, *he hath contracted the contagion of ancient death in his first Nativity, who in this respect comes more easily to receive remission of sinnes, because not his owne sinnes, but anothers are forgiven him:* So that whereas you say, that *Cyprian proves: that Infants are to be baptized because they are under Originall sinne, they neede pardon;* You may perceive that the argument is rather thus, they have lesser sinnes then others, they neede lesse pardon then men of growne yeares, and therefore there is lesse hinderance in them to come to Gods grace, remission of sinnes and Baptisme: thus have I considered that famous resolution of a Councel of 66. Bishops, which for the nakednes of it I should more willingly have covered, were it not that the truth hath so much suffered by the great esteeme that this absurd Epistle hath had in many Ages.

§. 8. Of the testimony of *Augustine.*

YOu adde next to *Cyprian Augustine,* who flourished about the yeare 405. according to *Perkins,* 410. according to *Vsher,* and I follow you to consider him next; for though *Ambrose* and *Hierome* are reckoned somewhat afore him about 30. or 20. yeares, yet they lived at the same time, and the Authority of *Augustine* was it which carryed the Baptisme of Infants in the following ages, almost without controule, as may appeare out of *Walafridus Strabo* placed by *Vsher,* at the yeare 840. who in his booke *De rebus Ecclesiasticis cap.* 26. having said *that in the first times, the grace of Baptisme was wont to be given to them onely, who were come to that integrity of minde and body, that they could know and understand, what profit was to be gotten in Baptisme, what is to be*

confessed

confessed, and beleived, what lastly is to be observed by them that are new borne in Christ; confirmes it by *Augustines* owne confession of himselfe continuing a *Catechumenus* long afore Baptized. But afterwards Christians understanding Originall sinne &c. *Ne perirent parvuli si sine remedio regenerationis gratiæ defungerentur, statuerunt eos baptizari in remissionem peccatorum quod & S. Augustinus in libro de baptismo parvulorum ostendit, & Africana testantur Concilia, & aliorum Patrum documenta quamplurima.* And then adds how God-fathers and God-mothers were invented and addes one superstitious and impious consequent on it in these words. *Non autem debet Pater vel mater de fonte suam suscipere sobolem ut sit discretio inter spiritalem generationem & carnalem, Quod si casu evenerit, non habebunt carnalis copulæ deniceps adinvicem consortium, qui in communni filio compaternitatis spiritale vinculum susceperant.* To which I adde that *Petrus Cluniacensis*, placed by *Usher*, at the yeare 1150. writing to three Bishops of *France* against *Peter de Bruis*, who denyed Baptisme of Infants, sayes of him, *that he did reject the Authority of the Latine Doctors, being himselfe a Latine, ignorant of Greeke*, and after having said *recurrit ergo ad scripturas*, therefore he runnes to the Scriptures: he alleageth the examples in the New Testament, of Christs curing of persons at the request of others, to prove Infants Baptisme by and then adds, *Quid vos ad ista? Ecce non de Augustino, sed de Evangelio protuli, cui cum maxime vos credere dicatis aut aliorum fide alios tandem posse salvari concedite, aut de Evangelio esse quæ posui si potestis, negate.* From these passages I gather, that as *Petrus Cluniacensis* urged for pædo-baptisme the authority of *Augustine* and the Latine Doctors, So *Peter de Bruis* and *Henricus* appealed to the Scriptures, and the Greeke Church: Now the reason of *Augustines* authority was this, the *Pelagian* heresie being generally condemned, and *Augustines* workes being greatly esteemed, as being the hammer of the *Pelagians*, the following refuters of *Pelagianisme*, *Prosper*, *Fulgentius* &c. the Councells that did condemne it as those of *Carthage*, *Arles Milevis &c.* did rest altogether on *Augustines* arguments, and often on his words, and *Augustine* in time was accounted one of the foure Doctors of the Church, esteemed like the foure Evangelists, so that his opinion was the rule of the Churches Judgement, and the schooles determination, as to the great hurt of Gods Church *Luther* and

others have beene of late. Now *Augustine* did very much insist on this argument to prove originall sinne, becaus Infants were baptized for remission of sinnes, and therefore in the Councill of *Milevis* he was adjudged accursed, that did deny it: But for my part I value *Augustines* judgement just at so much, as his proofes and reasons weigh, which how light they are you may conceive.

Augustin. tom 1. Confess lib. 1. c. 11 & Signabar signo Crucis ejus & condebar ejus sale jam inde ab utero matris meæ, quæ multum sperabit in te And then followes, how being young and falling sick, he desired, and his mother thought to have him baptized, but upon his recovery it was differred.

First, In that whereas he makes it so Universall a tradition, his owne baptisme, not till above thirty, though educated as a Christian by his mother *Monica*, the Baptisme of his sonne *Adeodatus* at 15. of his friend *Alipius*, if there were no more, were enough to prove that this custome of baptizing infants, was not so received, as that the Church thought necessary that all children of Christians by profession should be baptized in their infancy. And though I conceive with *Grotius* annot. in *Matth.* 19. 14. *that baptisme of Infants was much more frequented, and with greater opinion of necessity in* Africa, *then in* Asia, *or other parts of the World, for* (saith he) *in the Councells you cannot finde ancienter mention of that custome, then the Councell of* Carthage. Yet I doe very much question whether they did in *Africa*, even in *Augustines* time baptize children, except in danger of death, or for the health of body, or such like reason: I do not finde that they held that Infants must be baptized out of such cases, for it is cleare out of sundry of *Augustines* Tracts, as particularly tract. 11 in *Johan*: that the order held of distinguishing the *Catechumeni* and baptized, and the use of Catechizing afore baptisme, still continued, yea and a great while after, insomuch that when *Petrus Cluniacensis* disputed against *Peter de Bruis*, he said only, *that there had beene none but infants baptized for* 300. *yeares, or almost* 500. *yeares in* Gallia, Spaine, Germany, Italy, *and all Europe*, and it seemes he denyed not the baptizing of growne persons in *Asia* still; whence I collect, that even in the Latine Church, after *Augustines* dayes, in sundry ages the baptizing of persons of growne age did continue as well as baptizing of infants, till the great darknes that over-spred the Westerne Churches, spoiled by Barbarous Nations, destitute of learned men, and ruled by ambitious and unlearned Popes, when there were none to Catechize, and therefore they baptized whole Countries upon the baptisme of the King of that Country, though both Prince and people knew little or nothing of Christianity, but were in respect of manners and knowledge Pagans still, which hath beene the great

cause

auſe of the upholding of Papacie, and corrupting of Chriſtian Churches, I mean this great corruption of baptizing, making Chriſtians, iving Chriſtendome (as it is called) afore ever perſons were taught hat Chriſtianity was, or if they were taught any thing, it was only ne ceremonies and rites of the Church, as they called them.

2. You may conceive how light *Auguſtine's* judgement was, by onſidering the ground upon which *Auguſtine* held, and urged the aptiſme of Infants ſo vehemently; which was, as all know that ad his works, the opinion he had, that without baptiſme Infants uſt be damned, by reaſon of originall ſinne, which is not taken away ut by Baptiſme, yea, though he wanted baptiſme out of neceſſity; rging thoſe places, *Joh.* 3. 5. *Rom.* 5. 12. continually in his diſputes gainſt the Pelagians, particularly *tom.* 7. *de natura & gratia, c.* 8. nd *tom.* 2. *ep.* 28. he ſaith, *Item quiſquis dixerit, quod in Chriſto vificabuntur etiam parvuli, qui ſine Sacramenti ejus participatione de ita exeunt, hic profecto & contra Apoſtolicam prædicationem venit, & totam condemnat eccleſiam.* And in the cloſe of the Epiſtle, calls , *robuſtiſſimam & fundatiſſimam fidem, qua Chriſti eccleſia, nec arvulos homines recentiſſime natos a damnatione credit, niſi per graiam domini Chriſti, quam in ſuis Sacramentis commendavit, poſſe berari.* And this, *Perkins* in his *Probleme*, proves, was the opinion f *Ambroſe*, and many more: And hence, as *Aquinas*, ſo *Bellarmine*, roves baptiſme of Infants, from *Joh.* 3 5. And this hath been ſtill ne principall ground. The ground that you go on, that the covenant f grace belongs to believers and their ſeed, I cannot find amongſt the ncients. Yea, as you may perceive out of *Perkins* in the place alcadged, although *Ambroſe*, and *Auguſtine* in his 4. book *de Baptiſmo ontra Donatiſtas, c.* 22. yielded, *that either Martyrdome, or the deire of Baptiſme, might ſupply the defect of Baptiſme*, and ſome of he School-men, *Biel, Cajetan, Gerſon*, do allow the *deſire and prayr of parents for children in the wombe, in ſtead of baptiſme*: Yet we nde no remedy allowed by them, but actuall baptiſme for children orn into the world: So ſtrictly did *Auguſtine* and the Ancients urge he neceſſity of Baptiſme for Infants born.

Rivet. trac. de Patrum authoritate, c. 9. *Auguſtinus æternis flammis adjudicat Infantes ſine baptiſmo morientes*

3. You may conſider, that *Auguſtine* held a like neceſſity of Inants receiving the Lords ſupper, from the words, *Joh.* 6. 53. as is lainly expreſſed by him, *lib.* 1. *de peccat. merit. & remiſ. c.* 20. And ccordingly, as in *Cyprians* time, the Communion was given to Inants, as appears by the ſtory which he relates of himſelf, giving the

Communion to an Infant, in his book *de lapsis*, mentioned by *August. epist.* 23. So it is confessed by *Maldonat* on *Joh.* 6. that *Innocentius* the first, Bishop of *Rome, held it necessary for Infants*; and that this *opinion and practise continued about* 600 *yeares in the Church*, though it be now rejected by the Romane Church in the Councel of *Trent*.

4. You may consider, that *Augustine* held such a certainty of obtaining regeneration by Baptisme, that not only he puts usually regeneration for Baptisme, but also he makes no question of the regeneration of Infants, though they that brought them, did not bring them with that faith, that they might be regenerated by spirituall grace to eternall life; but because by Baptisme they thought to procure health to their bodies, as is plain by his words, *epist.* 23. *ad Bonifacium. Nec illud te moveat, quod quidam non ea fide ad Baptismum percipiendum parvulos ferunt, ut gratia spiritali ad vitam regenerentur aternam, sed quod eos putant hoc remedio temporalem retinere aut recipere sanitatem: non enim propterea illi non regenerantur, quia non ab illis hac intentione offeruntur; celebrantur enim per eos necessaria ministeria.* By which last words you may perceive how corrupt *Augustine* was in this matter, so as to excuse, if not to justifie their fact, who made use of Baptisme in so profane a manner, as to cure diseases by it: which is no marvaile, if it be be true which is related, of the approbation that was given of the Baptisme used by *Athanasius* in play amongst boyes.

5. You may consider, that in the same Epistle, when *Bonifacius* pressed *Augustine* to shew how Sureties could be excused from lying, who being asked of the Childs faith, answered, *He doth believe*, (for even in Baptisme of Infants they thought in all ages it necessary that a profession of faith go before) He defends that act in this absurd manner: *Respondetur credere propter fidei Sacramentum*, And thence is he called a believer, because he hath the Sacrament of faith. Which as it is a ridiculous playing with words, in so serious a matter before God, so it is a senslesse answer, sith the interrogation was of the Childs faith before it was baptized, and the answer was given before, and therefore it cannot be understood of believing by receiving the sacrament of faith, which came after.

6. It is apparent out of the same Epistle, that Infants were then admitted to baptisme, whether they were the children of believers, or not; it was no matter with what intention they brought them, nor whose children were brought; yea it was counted a work of charity to bring any children to baptisme, and in this case the faith

of

f the whole Church was counted a sufficient supplement of the de-ect of the parents or bringers faith: So that whereas the present de-enders of Infant-baptisme, pretend Covenant-holinesse a priviledge f Believers, it was no such matter in the time of the Ancients, but hey baptized any Infants, even of Infidels, upon this opinion, That Baptisme did certainly give grace to them; and if they dyed with-ut baptisme, they did perish. And thus I grant that it is true, the *Epistle of* Cyprian *is cited and approved by* Augustine: but neither is *Augustine* to be approved for approving it, nor doth it advantage your tenet, that you have cited his citation of it.

§. 9. Of the testimonies of *Hierom* and *Ambrose*.

NExt to *Augustine* you place *Hierom*, and it is true *that he cites and approves* Cyprians *Epistle, in the end of his third book of his Dialogues against the Pelagians*; and *he cites, and approves, and commends* Augustine's *books, de peccat. merito, & remissione, ad Marcellinum*, in which he maintains baptisme of Infants, and Infant-communion, as necessary to salvation, and the certainty of regeneration nd salvation to Infants that are baptized, and receive the Lords sup-er. So that the same answer is to be given concerning *Hierom*, vhich is to be given concerning *Augustine*. The last you alleadge, s *Ambrose*, who lived about the same time, though he be placed some eares before *Augustine* and *Hierom*; And it is confessed that he vas of the same judgement, and many other of the Ancients of the ame time, and in after-ages, but nothing comparable to those al-eady named, and therefore adding no more weight to the cause.

§. 10. Of the validity of proof by these testimonies, and of the evidences that Infant-baptism is an innovation.

NOw these, you say, *you relate not to prove the truth of the thing, but only the practise of it.* It is well you added this, that you night disclaime the validity of these testimonies for proof; for the ruth is, they rather prove the thing to be an error, than a truth, which vas held upon such erroneous ground as they taught and practised it, o wit, *the necessity of Baptisme to salvation*, Joh. 3.5. *The certainty f remission of originall sin by baptisme*; *The denying of Gods grace o none*, *And the perishing of those to whom Baptisme was not given.* Whether you have any better proofs, I shall consider hereafter: in he mean time this I adde. 1. That concerning the practise, your te-timonies prove not, that it was in practise, but in case of supposed ecessity. 2. That there was still in use a constant course of bapti-ing, not only the converted from infidelity, but also the grown hildren of professed believers, when they were at full age. 3. That hey did alike conceive a necessity of, and accordingly practise the gi-ing of the Lords supper to Infants. 4. That they made no distinc-

on

Chamier panstr. Cathol. to. 4. l. 5. c. 15. §. 19. Denique hunc morem quis non videt ejus temporis esse cum vix millesimus quisque bapt zabatur non adultus, & in Catechumenis diligenter exercitus.

H. Hamond, A practicall Catech. *l.* 1. §. 3. *pag.* 23. And those other fundamentals of faith which all men were instructed in anciently, before they were permitted to be baptized.

on between the Infants of believers and unbelievers being brought to them. 5. That your ancientest testimonie for practise, according to any Rule determined, is *Cyprian*, neer 300 yeeres after Christ. 6. Lastly, there are many evidences that do as strongly prove, as proofs are usually taken in such matters, That it was not so from the beginning : As particularly, 1. The continued propounding of the ordinary questions even to Infants, concerning their faith, repentance, and obedience, afore they were baptized, which in the School-men was still held necessary, and therefore Sureties thought necessary to answer for them, yea even in Reformed Churches, unto this day: which as it was conceived by *Strabo*, and *Vives* in his Comment on *Aug. lib.* 1. *de civit. Dei, c.* 27. a cleare evidence ; so I conceive any reasonable man will think it to be a manifest proof, that at first none were baptized but such as understood the faith of Christ. 2. The examples before mentioned, of the baptizing *Gregory Nazianzen, Chrysostom, Augustine, Constantine the great* &c. being children of professors of Christianity, is a manifest proof they did not then baptize Infants ordinarily, but extraordinarily in case of necessity. 3. Specially if we joyn hereto the dissuasions of *Tertullian*, and *Gregory Nazianzen* forementioned. 4. The plain testimony of the Councel of *Neo Cæsarea* against it, before mentioned. 5. The silence of the chief writers, *Eusebius*, &c. concerning it. 6. The many passages in *Augustine*, and others, referring it only to Apostolicall tradition, and thus usually proved by no higher testimony than *Cyprian*, & that brought in upon erroneous grounds, is a strong evidence it came not from the Apostles. To all which I may add the testimony of *Hugo Grotius* before recited, concerning the Greek Church ; the testimony of *Ludovicus Vives, Comment. in August. de civit. Dei, l.* 1. *c.* 27. affirming *that he heard, the old use continued in some Cities of* Italy, *of not baptizing, till the party baptized did desire it.* Which it seems *Bellarmine*, an Italian, when he mentions that speech of *Vives*, did not deny. More testimonies and evidences might be brought out of sundry authors : but these are enough to me, and I think to any that search into Antiquity, to prove, that the custome of baptizing Infants was not from the beginning, and therefore is but an Innovation : especially that your tenet, and practise accordingly, is a very late innovation. [*That Baptisme is to be given to Infants of Believers only, because of supposed Covenant-holinesse*] not elder then *Zuinglius*, and so not much above one hundred yeares old, so far as I can find.

Ant

Antipædobaptiſme hath no ill influence on Church, or Common-wealth.

PART. II.

Concerning the prejudices againſt Antipædobaptiſts, from their miſcarriages.

§. 1. Of the fitnes of placing the Narration of miſcarriages of oppoſers of *Pædobaptiſme.*

HAving examined the firſt part of that you produce for baptizing of infants, I proceede to the ſecond, taken from the noveltie and miſcarriages of the oppoſers of it. And here I wiſh you had remembred the order of the *Areopagites* mentioned by *Smectymnuus* that in pleading cauſes before them prefaces ſhould be avoyded, as tending to create prejudice in the Judges. For to what end ſerves this your Narration of your adverſaries, but to beget an Odium, hatred or prejudice at leaſt in your Auditors? which if it had come after other arguments might have been more excuſable, but placed as it is, neither ſuites with ſerenity of minde fit for judging in you, or your Auditors. Unto which give me leave to adde, that the courſes taken by too many, as timely by the Author of the Frontiſpice to Doctor *Featlies* booke, which is light and immodeſt, by Mr. *Edwards* in his prejudices againſt the perſons of his oppoſites, as, that none that ever maintained *Antipædobaptiſme*, lived and died with repute in the Church of God: the hiſtorie of the *Anabaptiſts*, the *Anabaptiſts* Catechiſme, with the invectives

vectives againſt this as an hereſie, everting the Fundamentals, as leading into all hereſie, over-throwing all government, uſed in Sermons every where to make *Antipædobaptiſts* odious, and to foreſtall men with prejudice, though, for the preſent they ſerve like *Meduſaes* head, to aſtoniſh men, ſpecially the more unlearned, yet are they not right courſes, but Artifices ſerving only to prevent impartiall diſcuſſing of things which is neceſſary that truth may appeare, and perhaps when truth ſhall appeare will returne on the head of the Authors of hem. But I reſolve to follow your ſteps.

§ 2. Of the oppoſers of Infant-baptiſme afore *Baltazar.*

"YOu begin thus. *And indeed although ſome in thoſe times que-*
" *ſtioned as* Auguſtine *grants in his Sermons* de verbis Apoſtol. *yet*
"*the firſt that ever made a head againſt it, or a diviſion in the Church*
"*about it, was* Baltazar Pacommitanus *in* Germany *in* Luthers *time, a-*
"*bout the yeare* 1527.

" You ſay, *in thoſe times ſome queſtioned, as* Auguſt. *grants in his*
" *Sermons* de verbis Apoſtol.,. But you doe not tell us who thoſe ſome were, nor in which Sermons, which might have been requiſite for your Reader. Upon ſearch I finde the 14. Sermon *De verbis, Apoſtol. om.* 10. intituled *de baptiſmo parvulorum contra Pelagianos*, but it is plaine out of that Sermon, and out of *Auguſtines* bookes of *Hereſies, ad Quod vult Deum, Tom. 6. Hereſ.* 88. and elſe where, that the *Pelagians* did grant the baptizing of Infants, becauſe they durſt not oppoſe the cuſtome of the Church, which in thoſe dayes was accounted Sacred, only they ſhifted off the proofe of originall ſinne from it, by ſaying *that they were baptized not for the remiſſion of ſinnes to eternall life, for they had none, but for the Kingdome of heaven, which ſhift Auguſtine* doth well refute in that Sermon, and alſo oppoſeth ſome others that taught, *that the child not baptized might enter into the Kingdome of Heaven.*

" *From* Auguſtines *time* you make a great leape, and ſay, *the firſt*
" *that ever made a head againſt, or a diviſion in the Church about it,*
" *was* Baltazar Pacommitanus *in* Germany *in* Luthers *time, about the*
yeare 1527. But therein you are much deceived. For *Caſſander* in his Teſtimonies of Infants baptiſme in the Epiſtle to the Duke of *Cleve*, tells us, that *Guitmund* Biſhop of *Averſe* mentioneth the famous *Berengarius, Anno.* 1030. oppoſing not only the corporall preſence of Chriſt in the Euchariſt, but alſo the baptiſme of little

little ones. And that a little after sprung in *Bernards* time an heresie of an uncertaine Originall and appellation, and he saith that they were called *Cathari* or *Puritans*, and from a Country of *France*, *Albigenses*, spread over *France* and lower *Germany*, and the banke of the *Rhine*; of these, he saith, *Hi reliquis erroribus quos a Manichæis et Priscillianistis mutuati sunt, hoc insuper addiderunt, ut Baptismum parvulorum inutilem esse dicerent, ut qui prodesse nemini queat qui non et ipse credere, et per seipsum Baptismi sacramentum petere possit, quale nihil Manichæos, & Priscillianistas docuisse legimus.* And indeed *Bernard*, who is placed by *Usher*, at the yeare 1130. just a 100. yeares after *Berengarius*, Sermon 66. in *Cantica*, mentions the Heresie of some, that had no name, because their heresie was not from man, nor received they it by man, but they boasted themselves, to be the successors of the Apostles, and called themselves *Apostolicos*: Now although he charge them with denying Marriage, and abstaining from meates, yet you may smell out of his owne words, that this was but a calumny; but take the Character he sets downe of them and weigh it, and you would conceive he had spoken of Protestants. *Irrident nos quia baptizamus Infantes, quod oramus pro mortuis, quod sanctorum suffragia postulamus*, and a little after, *Non credunt autem ignem purgatorium restare post mortem, sed statim animam solutam a corpore, vel ad requiem transire, vel ad damnationem*, And a little after. *Jam vero qui Ecclesiam non agnoscunt, non est mirum, si ordinibus Ecclesiæ detrahunt, si instituta non recipiunt, si sacramenta contemnunt, si mandatis non obediunt.* The same *Bernard* in Epist. 204. writes to *Hildefonsus* Earle of S. *Gyles*, to take away *Henricus* once a Monke, then an Apostate, *quod dies festos, sacramenta, Basilicas, Sacerdotes sustulerit, quod parvulis Christianorum Christi intercluditur vita, dum baptismi negatur gratia, nec saluti propinquare sinuntur*, and it is well known that *Petrus Cluniacensis* who is placed by *Usher* at the yeare 1150. hath written an Epistle to three Bishops of *France* against *Peter de Bruis* and *Henricus*, as defending errors digested into 5. Articles. First, *That little ones may not be baptized.* Secondly, *that Temples or Altars are not to be made*, Thirdly, *that the Crosse of Christ is not to be adored or worshipped, but rather to be broken and trodden under foote.* Fourthly, *that the Masse is nothing, nor ought to be Celebrated.* Fiftly, *that the benefits of the living nothing profited*

the deceaſed, that we are not to chant to God. He ſaith that the hereſie of the *Petrobruſians*, was received in the Cities of *Gallia Narbonenſis*, and complaines, *that the people were rebaptized, the Churches profaned, the Altars digged downe, the Croſſes fired, on the day it ſelfe of the Lords paſſion, fleſh was openly eaten, the Prieſts ſcourged, Monks impriſoned, and by terrours and torments compelled to marry Wives.* All this was done very neare 400. yeares before *Baltazar Pacommitanus*, or as others write him *Pacimontanus.*

§ 3. Of *Baltazar Pacimontanus.*

But perhaps you thinke however, that *Baltazar* was the firſt that oppoſed the baptiſme of Infants in the 16. Century, which poſſibly may be true, though herein you follow *Cochlæus* and *Bellarmine*, who addes that *Eraſmus* himſelfe had ſowed ſome ſeedes of it alſo, but *Gerhard* the *Lutheran* in the 40th Tome of his Common places, where he handles this queſtion, rather derives the Originall from *Caroloſtadius*, and alleageth *Melanæthon*, *Com.* on *Coloſſ.* and ſaith, that he is called the father of the Anabaptiſts by *Eraſmus Alberus.* Now I doe not finde in *Melanæthon* that which *Gerhard* ſaith of him, yet *Sleidan* ſaith of him, that he praiſed their opinion, and *Oſiander* that he joyned himſelfe unto them, and I finde that *Melanæthon* in his Comment on 1 *Cor.* 9. 24. ſayes of him *that he indeavoured to promote the Goſpel, though in a wrong courſe. Arnoldus Meſhovius hiſt: Anabap: lib.* 1. §. 2. ſayes that the buſineſſe of Anabaptiſme began at *Wittenberg*, Anno *Chriſti*, 1522. *Luther* then lurking in the Caſtle of *Wartpurg* in *Thuringia*, by *Nicolas Pelargus*, and that he had Companions at firſt, *Caroloſtadius*, *Philip Melanæthon* and others, and that *Luther* returning from his *Patmos* as he called it, baniſhed *Caroloſtadius* and the reſt, and only received *Philip Melanæthon* into favour againe. Now they that know what was *Luthers* vehemency and pertinacy on the one ſide, and *Melanæthons* timerouſneſſe on the other ſide, may well conceive, hat as in the buſineſſe of Images in Churches, and Conſubſtantiation, ſo in this about Infant-baptiſme the temper of theſe two men much hindred the clearing of this truth, perhaps fearing that a further reformation then they had begun, would be an occaſion of nullifying, all they had done. Surely it hath beene the unhappy fate of the reformed Churches, that they have ſo ſtucke to *Luther*, and *Calvin*, that they have ſcarce ſtepped one ſtep further in reformation then they did, but ſtifly maintained onely the ground they had gotten.

gotten. *Cassander* in his Epistle to he D. of *Cleve* before mentioned, reckons the error of Anabaptisme to have bin revived about the yeare 1622. by *Nicolas Stork* or *Pelargus* & *Thomas Munzer*; but it is not *res tanti* to search any further into this matter, nor is it of any weight to enquire much after this *Baltazar*. He is stiled *Baltazar Huebmer Pacimontanus*, Dr. in *Waldshuot*, in the Epistle *Zuinglius* writes to him, before his answer to his booke about baptisme, & in the Epistle *Zuinglius* wrote to *Gynoræus*, he relates how he came to *Zurich*, and was there demanded by the Emperor, who it seemes sought his life, there he made some recantation, but it appeares he was afterwards taken and burnt at *Vienna* in *Austria* Anno, 1528. For what cause I know not. *Zuinglius* saith this of him in his Epistle to *Gynoræus*. *Nos dexteritatem spectamus in homine, ac mediocritatis studium, in eo autem homine (falli cupio) nihil quam immoderatam rei gloriæque sitim deprehendisse visus sum ipse mihi.* And *Osiander at the yeare* 1528. saith only of him, he was *Homo fanaticus et crassus Anabaptista*. But I leave him to his Judge to whom *he* stands or falls, only I marvaile I reade no worse, specially in *Osiander*, said of one that is accounted a leader in so hated a sect.

§. 4 Of rebaptizing.

"YOu goe on, *Since that time multitudes in* Germany *have imbraced his opinion, who because they opposed pædobaptisme, were forced to reiterate their owne baptisme, and thence were called Anabaptists.* Afore I proceed, because it goes so currant, that rebaptization is not only an errour, but also an heresie, let me beg of you one good argument to prove it unlawfull *in se*, or intrinsecally, I meane without respect to scandall, or the like cause by accident, for a man that hath beene baptized rightly, to be baptized againe: One baptisme *Eph.* 4 5. is not to me all one as once baptizing, no more then one faith once beleiving, We are regenerated by baptisme, and a man is borne but once. But are we not borne againe by the Word, and must that be but once preached? Is not sinne mortified, the Church sanctified by baptisme, and are not these often? And for example, if there were as good for pædobaptisme, as that *Act.* 19. 5, 6. for rebaptizing, the controversie were at an end with me. But if heresie must be determined by the votes of men, *Smectymnuus* may be judged an *Arian*, and the opposers of *Pasche* Hereticks: this by the way, though not besides the matter.

§ 5. Of the *Anabaptists* in *Germanie*, and the *Antiprelatists* in England.

"YOu goe on, *And soone proved a dangerous and turbulent sect, not only working a world of mischeife about* Munster, *and other*

"*parts of* Germany, *but have with this opinion drunke in abundance*
"*of other dangerous heresies and blasphemies, and quickly grew into*
"*such divisions and subdivisions among themselves, that* Bullinger
"*notes that they were growne to no lesse then* 14. *Sects in his time*
"*which is indeed the common lot of all Sectaries.*

To all which I only answer thus, that much of this is true I make no question, though perhaps vehemency of opposition, hath made matters more or worse then they were, as it is wont to be in such cases, and I finde that *Gualter* in his Apology for *Zuinglius* saith of them, *veritatis studiosi videri vellent*, and *Cassander* speakes favourably of some of them. But it is no marvaile that when men grow into sects, such things happen, especially when the reformation of an abuse is denyed men by an orderly Synodicall way, and the persons that seeke it, declaimed against, accused, and accursed, and persecuted as *Schismaticks* and *Heretiques*; and unlearned and factious men, joyne with a discontented party for sinister ends, so that the men that hold an opinion have no regular Ministery, nor orderly meetings to debate or conclude of things amongst themselves; and to agree upon a confession of their doctrine, to be by all avouched. But have not the like, if not the same things happened in other matters? Did not the like troubles happen in Q. *Elizabeths* dayes in seeking to remove *Episcopacy* & Ceremonies? Did not some of them grow a dangerous and turbulent Sect? was not the practise of *Hacket* and his companions like that of *John* a *Leyden* at *Munster*? Did not divisions and other miscarriages and persecutions, bring the Non-conformists of *England* as low as the Anabaptists? Did not *Whitgift* long agoe compare the Anabaptists principles with the Nonconformists of *England*, and *Hooker* in his preface to his bookes of Ecclesiasticall policy, their proceedings, manners & pretences together? and yet *Episcopacy* is now found an abuse and so may in time be Pædo-baptisme. Indeed these miscarriages were argumentative if they did arise from the nature of the doctrine taught: but when they come only from the weakenes, or rashnes, or malignity of the assertors, or from the violence of opposers, we must not jumble things together, but by sifting the matter to the bran, sever the nature of the doctrine from the quality and actions of the teachers, else we shall as soone loose truth as finde it: Now whether the nature of the Doctrine that denies Pædobaptisme, inferre any such turbulent effects, I shall consider in examining that which followes.

And

§.6. Of Anabaptists opposing Magistracy.

'And because this opinion and divers others which depend upon it, 'begins unhappily to take place, and spread among our selves in 'his Kingdome.

You do not expresse what those opinions are which depend upon it, 'Mr. *Richard Vines* in his Sermon on *Eph.*4.14.*pag.*13. Having sayd 'what heresie ever came abroade, without Verbum Domini *in the* 'mouth of it? and th n after the *Arians* plea, he saith the *Anabap-* 'tists from Matth. 28.19. *Goe yee therfore and disciple all nations;* 'and when we shalbe thriven to his auxu or full stature, he will under- 'mine *Magistracy by that* Rom. 12.19. *Avenge not your selves.*

But how knowes Mr. *Vines* this? I do not take Mr. *Vines* for a Prophet & to inferre this by reason, The *Anabaptist* urgeth *Matth* 28. 19. against pædobaptisme, *Ergo*, he will urge *Rom.*12.19. against Magistracy, is in my slender apprehension *a baculo ad angulum.* I doe not feare to averre, and doubt not but to be able to make it good, that the principle by which he proves pædobaptisme, from the reason & equity of the rule of circumcision, doth by just consequence undermine, I will not say all Magistracy, but much of the Magistracy and Lawes of the Kingdome of *England*, as they are at this day. Perhaps he may say the *Anabaptists* heretofore have opposed Magistracy. I reply, Have none of the adversaries of the *Anabaptists* undermined Magistracy? Since the actions of *Muncer* and *Munster* I finde not either in writing or action any opposition but the *Battenburgick* after mentioned (which what they were I know not) made by the *Anabaptists* against the Magistrates or Magistracy. I cannot but thinke it necessary to insert the words of *Cassander* a Papist in his Epistle to the Duke of *Gulicke* and *Cleve. Hujus quem dixi Memnonis cui nunc hic Theodoricus successit, sectatores fere sunt omnes, qui per hæc Belgicæ, & inferioris Germaniæ loca huic Anabaptisticæ heresi affines deprehenduntur, in quibus magna ex parte pii cujusdam animi argumenta cernas, qui imperito quodam zelo incitati, errore potius quam animi malitia a vero divinarum literarum sensu, et concordi totius Ecclesiæ consensu desciverunt. Quod ex eo perspici potest, quod Monasterienses, et hinc consequutis Batenburgicis a Iohanne Batenburgo, post cladem Monasterienses excitatis furoribus, Novam quandam restitutionem regni Christi, quod in deletione impiorum per vim externam positum sit meditantibus acerrime semper restiterunt, et in sola cruce Regni Christi instaurationem et propagationem consistere docuerunt, quo fit ut qui hujusmodi sunt, Commiseratione potius et emendatione quam insectatione et perditione digni videantur.* How unlike is Mr.

Vines

Vines his ſpeech to the Lord Major & City of *London*, to theſe words of *Caſſander* a Papiſt, to the D. of *Cleve* a Papiſt. And for thoſe in theſe dayes, that deny or queſtion Pædo-baptiſme, as I know them not, or very few of them, ſo I cannot ſay what they do, or hold, as being not privy to their tenets or proceedings, onely underſtanding by one of your aſſembly, that there was a little book put forth intitled *the compaſſionate Samaritane*, upon peruſall I found that that Author, who ever he were, accounts it a calumny to charge the Anabaptiſts with oppoſing Magiſtracy. But concerning this, the confeſſion of faith, lately put forth in the name of 7 Churches of them *Artic.* 48, 49. will give beſt information. But if you meane not this but ſome other error depending on the opinion of *Antipædobaptiſme*, when I meete with them in your Sermon, I ſhall in their proper place, conſider whether they do depend on it or no, and for the opinion it ſelfe, I ſay, if it be not truth, the ſpreading of it is unhappy, if it be truth, the more it ſpreads, the more happy it is for the Kingdome.

§. 7. Of the hindering of reformation by *Anabaptiſme*.

"YOu ſay further. *And ſo the worke of reformation Without Gods* " *mercy likely to be much hindered by it.*

Sir, you now touch upon a very tender point, in which it concerned you, and it in like manner concernes me, and all that have any love to *Ieſus Chriſt*, or his people, to be very conſiderate in what we ſay. I have entred into Covenant to endeavour a reformation as well as you, and though I have not had the happines, (as indeed wanting ability) to be imployed in that eminent manner you have beene in the promoting of it (in which I rejoyce) yet have I in my affections ſincerely deſired it, in my intentions truely aimed at it, in my prayers heartily ſought it, in my ſtudies conſtantly minded it, in my indeavours ſeriouſly proſecuted it, for the promoting of it greatly ſuffered, as having as deepe an intereſt in it as other men. Now begging this *Poſtulatum*, or demand, that Pædobaptiſme is a corruption of *Chriſts* inſtitution, which upon the reading of my anſwer, and the 12 reaſons of my doubts formerly mentioned, will appeare not to be a mere *Petitio principii* begging that which is to be proved. I ſay this being granted, I humbly conceive that Pædobaptiſme is a Mother-Corruption, that hath in her wombe moſt of thoſe abuſes in diſcipline and manners, and ſome of thoſe errors in doctrine that doe defile the reformed Churches; and therefore that the reformation will be ſo far from being hindred by removing it, that indeed it is the only way to further reformation, to begin

begin in a regular way, at the purging that ordinance of *Iesus Christ*, to wit of Baptisme, without which, experience shewes how insufficient after-Catechizing, Excommunication, Confirmation, *Vnio reformata*, solemne Covenant, Separation, & the New Church-Covenant, invented or used to supply the want of it, are, to heale the great abuses about the admitting visible professors into the priviledge of the Church, from whence spring a great part, if not all the abuses in discipline, receiving the *Lords Supper*, and manners of Christian people. And therefore, I earnestly beseech in the bowels of *Iesus Christ*, both you, and all others, that ingage themselves for God, to take this matter into deepe consideration. I am sensible how inconsiderable a person I am, and how inconsiderable a number there be that are affected with this motion, I do consider how much against the streame of the Reformed Churches, such a reformation would be. Yet when I consider how far fetched the reasons for Pædobaptisme are, how cleare the institution of *Christ* is against it, how happily truthes opposed with as much prejudice as this, have beene in processe of time vindicated, of what moment the knowledge of this point is to every conscience, how exact a reformation our solemne Covenant binds us to endeavour; I do not despaire but that this truth also may take place upon second thoughts, where it hath beene rejected at the first, nor doe I doubt but in time Gods people will consider what an influence baptisme had of old into the comfort and obligation of consciences, and how little it hath now. And truely Sir, though it may be but my weaknes, yet I suppose it can doe you no hurt to tell it; I feare you want much of that blessing, which was hoped for by your Assembly, in that you do waste so much time about inconsiderable things comparatively, and hastily passe over or exclude from examination this which deserves most to be examined, but rather seeke to stop the bringing of it to any tryall. But having told you thus much, I follow you in your Sermon.

§. 8. The Anti-pædobaptists principle overthrows not the Lords day; the Pædobaptists principle reduceth Judaisme, and Popish Ceremonies and addes to the Gospell.

'You say, *I shall God-willing handle this question more largely then I have done any other in this place, and the rather because of three other great mischeifes which go along with it. First I see that all that reject the baptizing of Infants, do & must upon the same grounds reject the religious observation of the Lords day, or the Christian Sabbath*, viz. *because there is not (say they) an expresse institution or command in the New Testament.*

Give me leave to take up the words of him in the *Poet*, πῶιον σε ἔπος φύγεν ἕρκος ὀδόντων, *What a word hath gotten out of the hedge of your teeth! They doe, They muſt.* Though I doubt not of your will, yet I ſee you want ſome skil in pleading for the Lords day, that others have: the truth is that it is neither ſo, nor ſo, *They neither doe, nor muſt reject upon the ſame ground the Lords day.* That they doe not I can ſpeake for one; and your owne words delivered after with more caution, *Verily I have hardly either knowne, or read, or heard,* intimate that though few, yet you cannot ſay, but you have heard, or read or knowne of ſome, that have not with baptizing of Infants rejected the Lords day; but you have, I preſume, heard or read of whole, and thoſe reformed Churches, that have upon ſuch a ground rejected the Lords day as not of divine inſtitution, who yet are zealous for pædobaptiſme. *Nor muſt they,* And to make that good, let us conſider their ground as you mention it. Their ground you ſay is, *becauſe there is not an expreſſe inſtitution or command in the New Teſtament*: this then is their principle, that what hath not an expreſſe inſtitution or command in the New Teſtament is to be rejected. But give me leave to tell you, that you leave out two explications that are needefull to be taken in; Firſt, that when they ſay ſo, they meane it of poſitive inſtituted worſhip, conſiſting in outward rites, ſuch as Circumciſion, Baptiſme and the Lords Supper are, which have nothing morall or naturall in them, but are in whole and in part Ceremoniall. For that which is naturall or morall in worſhip, they allow an inſtitution or command in the old Teſtament as obligatory to Chriſtians, and ſuch doe they conceive a Sabbath to be, as being of the Law of nature, that outward worſhip being due to God, dayes are due to God to that end, and therefore even in *Paradiſe*, appointed from the creation; and in all nations, in all ages obſerved: enough to prove ſo much to be of the Law of nature, and therefore the fourth Commandement juſtly put amongſt the Morals; and if a ſeventh day indefinitely be commanded there, as ſome of your Aſſembly have indeavourd to make good, I ſhall not gainſay: though in that point of the *quota pars temporis* which is moral, I do yet ἐπέχειν ſuſpend my judgement. Now Circumciſion hath nothing moral in it, it is meerely poſitive, neither from the beginning, nor obſerved by all nations in all ages, nor in the Decalogue, and therefore a Sabbath may ſtand, though it fall. 2. The other explication is, that when they require expreſſe inſtitution or command in the New Teſtament, they doe not meane that in poſitive worſhip there muſt be

a

a command *totidem verbis*, in so many words, in forme of a precept, but they conceive that Apostolicall example, which hath not a meere temporary reason, is enough to prove an institution from God, to which that practise doth relate. And in this, after some evidences in the Scripture of the New Testament, they ascribe much to the constant practise of the Church in all ages. Now then if it be considered, that when *Paul* was at *Troas*, *Acts*. 20.7. the Disciples came together to breake bread, and *Paul* preached upon the first day of the weeke, and *Paul*, 1 *Cor*. 16.1.2. as he had appointed in the Churches of *Galatia*, so he appoints at *Corinth* collections for the poore the first day of the week; & *Revel*. 1.10. it hath the *Elogium* or title of the Lords day; and it was so Sacred among Christians, that it was made the question of inquisitors of Christianity, *Dominicum servasti*? Hast thou kept the Lords day? to which was answered, *Christianus sum, intermittere non possum*, I am a Christian, I may not omit it: it is cleare evidence to me, that either Christ or the Apostles, having abrogated the old Sabbath, *Col*. 2.16. subrogated the first day of the weeke instead of it. Now if a moity of this could be brought for Pædobaptisme, in the stead of Circumcision of infants, I should subscribe to it with you. But Pædobaptisme not consisting with the order of Christ in the institution, being contrary to the usage of it by *John* the *Baptist*, & the Apostles, there being no foote-steps of it, till the erroneous conceit grew of giving Gods grace by it, and the necessity of it to save an infant from perishing, some hundreds of yeares after Christs incarnation; I dare not assent to the practise of it upon a supposed analogy, equity or reason of the rule of Circumcision, and imaginary confederation with the beleiving parent in the Covenant of grace. For to me it is a dangerous principle upon which they go that so argue: to wit, that in meere positive things (such as Circumcision and Baptism are) we may frame an addition to Gods worship from analogy or resemblance conceived by us betweene two ordinances, whereof one is quite taken away, without any institution gathered by precept or Apostolicall example. For if we may doe it in one thing, why not in a nother? where shall we stay? They that read the Popish expositors of their Rituals, doe know that this very principle hath brought in Surplice, Purification of women, &c. that I mention not greater matters. I desire any learned man to set me downe a rule from Gods Word, how far I may go in my conceived parity of reason, equity or analogy, and where I must

Vid. Rainold. Confer. with *Hart*, c.8 §.4.

ſtay; when it will be ſuperſtition and will worſhip, when not; when my conſcience may be ſatisfied, when not? That which Chriſt and his Apoſtles have taken from the Jewes, and appointed to us, we receive as they have appointed: but if any other man, if a Pope, or Oecumenicall Councel take upon them to appoint to mens Conſciences any rite in whole or in part, upon his owne conceived reaſon from ſuppoſed analogy with the Jewiſh ceremonies, it is an high preſumption in ſuch againſt Chriſt, and againſt the Apoſtles command to yeeld to it, *Col.*2.20. though it hath a ſhew of wiſedome, *v.*23 And the Apoſtles example, *Gal.*2.3 4 5. binds us to oppoſe it, when it is likely to bring us into bondage. And for the other pillar upon which at this day pædobaptiſme is built, it is to me very dangerous, viz. *That the Covenant of Evangelicall grace is made to beleivers and their ſeede, that the children are confederates with the Parents in the Covenant of grace.* Which without ſuch reſtrictions or explications as agree not with the common uſe of the words (which in the plaine ſenſe import this, that God in his Covenant of grace by Chriſt hath promiſed not only to juſtifie and ſave beleiving Parents, but alſo their children) is in my apprehenſion plainly againſt the Apoſtles determination, *Rom.*9.6,7, 8. makes an addition to the Goſpell mentioned *Gal.*3.8 9. and drawes with it many dangerous conſequences, which I abhorre. You adde, "*Now God hath ſo bleſſed the religious obſervation of the Lords day* "*in this Kingdome above other Churches and Kingdomes, that ſuch as* "*indeavour to overthrow it, deſerve juſtly to be abhorred by us.* Upon occaſion of which paſſage I only deſire to intimate to you, that from happy events its not ſafe to conclude, that a thing pleaſeth God. You know it is the way the Monks and Prelates uſe to inferre that their inſtitution is of God, becauſe their Orders have yeelded ſo many pious Confeſſors, Martyrs and Saints; & it too much countenanceth the way of arguing for Independency (by which it hath prevailed) in Letters from abroad, and ſuggeſtions at home, ſtill harping on this ſtring, that it is the way of God, becauſe they that are in that way thrive & grow more ſpirituall then others. And if this arguing be good, It proſpers, therefore it pleaſeth God; then it will follow on the contrary, It proſpers not, therefore it pleaſeth not God: And if ſo, we might inferre Infantbaptiſme is of men, not of God, ſith *if conſcience and experience may ſpeake, there are but few Chriſtians that have taſted the ſweete & comfort of their baptiſme, as* Mr. *Shepard*, Epiſtle before *Philips* vindi: of infant-bapt. The other note is this, that when you ſay, that ſuch

as

as indeavour to overthrow the religious obſervation of the Lords day, deſerve juſtly to be abhorred by us, it muſt be taken *cum grano ſalis*, with caution of ſuch as doe it againſt cleare light, with a malitious ſpirit: Otherwiſe your words reach to forraigne reformed Churches & their teachers, yea in a ſort to your ſelfe, who may be ſaid interpretatively to indeavour to overthrow it, while you build it on the ſame ground with pædobaptiſme. But I proceede.

§. 9. Of the evill of ſeperating from the Miniſtry and Communion of Chriſtians by reaſon of this opinion.

"YOu ſay, *Secondly the teachers of this opinion, Where ever they pre-*
" *vaile, take their Proſelites wholy off from the Miniſtery of the*
" *Word and Sacraments, and all other acts of Chriſtian Communion*
" *both publique and private, from any but thoſe that are of their owne*
" *opinion, condemning them all, as limbes of* Antichriſt, *Worſhippers and*
" *followers of the Beaſt.*

This is indeed a wicked practiſe, juſtly to be abhorred, the making of ſects upon difference of opinion, reviling, ſeparating from their teachers and brethren otherwiſe faithfull, becauſe there is not the ſame opinion in diſputable points, or in cleare truths non-fundamentall, is a thing too frequent in all ſorts of Dogmatiſts, and yet ſo contrary to common charity, which teacheth us to beare all things, to the rules of heathens, who could ſay, *Non eadem ſentire duos de rebus iiſdem incolumi licuit ſemper amicitia*, It hath bin alwayes allowed that friends; ſhould differ in opinion about the ſame things, & yet continue friends, much more againſt that neare concorporation of Chriſtians: that I looke upon it as one of the great plagues of Chriſtianity, you ſhal have me joyne with you in ſhewing my deteſtation of it. Yet nevertheleſſe, Firſt, It is to be conſidered, that this is not the evill of *Antipædobaptiſme*; you confeſſe ſome are otherwiſe minded, and therefore muſt be charged on the perſons, not on the aſſertion it ſelfe, and about this what they hold, you may have now beſt ſatisfaction from the confeſſion of faith in the name of ſeven Churches of them, *Art.* 33. and others following. Secondly, It is fit when ſuch things happen, that godly Miniſters ſhould looke upon it as their affliction, & take occaſion *excutere ſemetipſos*; to ſearch themſelves whether they have not by their harſh uſage of their brethren, unjuſt charging them, miſreporting their tenents, ſtirring up hatred in Magiſtrates & people againſt them, inſtead of inſtructing them, unſatisfying, handling of doubtfull queſtions, and by other wayes alienated them from. And I make bold to let you underſtand, that among others you have beene one cauſe at my ſtartling at this point of Pædobaptiſme, remembring

a very moveing passage which is in your Sermon Preached and printed on 2 Chron. 15. 2. *Concerning the hedge that God hath set about the 2. Commandement, that you admire that ever mortal man should dare in Gods worship, to meddle any jot further then the Lord himselfe hath commanded.*

§. 10. Of the condition into which the opinion of Anti-pædobaptisme puts the infants of believers, of originall sin, salvation out of the Church, and Covenant of grace.

"I Come after you. *Thirdly, this opinion puts all the Infants of all be-*
" *lievers into the self-same condition with the Infants of Turkes*
" *and Indians.*

And so doth the opinion of *Cyprian* with his 66. Bishops, that *would have Gods grace denyed to none.* And so do the words of the grave confutation of the *Brownists*, put forth by Mr. *Rathband*, Part. 3. pag. 50. *Children may be lawfully accounted within Gods Covenant, if any of their Ancestors in any generations were faithfull.* Exod. 20. 5. But it may be you do not so. I pray you then tell me, wherein you make their condition different? Possibly if you open your selfe plainly, there will be no difference between us. I will deale freely with you herein. 1. Concerning Gods Election, I am not certaine any more, concerning the election of a believers Infant, then an unbelievers. I rest upon Gods words, *I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy*, Rom. 9. 15. 2. For the Covenant or promise of grace, that is, righteousnesse and life in Christ, though I acknowledge a peculiar promise to *Abrahams* naturall posterity, mentioned *Rom.* 11 27. Yet I know not that God hath made such a covenant to any, much lesse to all the naturall seed of any believing Gentile; if you can shew me such a Character, I shall count it a treasure: but I dare not forge such grants. 3. Yet I grant that the present estate of a believers Infants hath a more comfortable likelihood that they are in Gods election, then the infants of Turks and Indians, both because they have their parents prayers, and the Churches for them, they have some promises, though generall, indefinite, and cōditional; & we find by experience, God doth very frequētly cōtinue his Church in their posterity, though it often happen that the childrē of godly parents prove very wicked. But this I dare not ground upon any promise of free grace, made to the child of a believer as such, for feare lest I incurre blasphemy, by challenging a promise which God doth not keep; nor upon any pretended law of friendship, lest that objection reflect on me, *Is there unrighteousnesse with God?* Rom. 9. 14. which the Apostle thought best to answer by asserting to God the most absolute liberty, *v.* 15. 18. 4. That the condition in respect of future hopes of a believers Infant

[illegible] a thousand times better then of a Turk or Indian, because it is born in the bosome of the Church, of godly parents, who by prayers, instruction, example, will undoubtedly educate them in the true faith of Christ, whereby they are not only as the Turks children, *in potentia Logica*, in a Logick possibility, or *in potentia remota*, in a remote possibility, but *in potentia proquinqua*, in a near possibility to be believers, and saved. And surely this is a great and certain priviledge enough to satisfie us, if we remember the distance between God and us: Nor do I feare to be gored by any of the three horns of your "Syllogisme, *of which one you say must unavoidably follow.* The first "is, *That either all are damned who die in their infancy, being without the Covenant of grace, having no part in Christ.* But this follows not; there is no necessity from any thing said before of their condition, that all of them should be damned, or be without the Covenant of grace, having no part in Christ: God may choose them all, or some, take all, or some into the covenant of Grace (which is, *I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed*, that is, mine Elect, *Rom.*9.8.11.) into communion with Christ (who dyed for the Elect, *Rom.*8.33,34.) notwithstanding any thing I have said of their condition. The second "is, *Or else all are saved, as having no originall sin, and consequently "needing no Saviour. Which most of the Anabaptists in the world do "owne, and therewith bring in also all Pelagianisme, universall grace, "free-will, &c.* This I imagine is the error you conceive depends upon Anti-pædobaptisme. I finde Mr. *Blake* stands much upon this in his Birth-right-priviledge, *pag.*17. where he saith, "*The Anabaptists "in this present age, well see, that all that joyn in this tenent saile be-"tween those rocks, either to affirm, that infants die in their pollution, "or perish in their birth-sin, or else to deny this originall pollution, or "any birth-sin at all.* But for my part I see no reason of this, unless it be granted that no infant can have sin forgiven, unless it be baptized. May it not be said, that some, or all infants are saved, notwithstanding their birth-sin, by the grace of God electing them, putting them into Christ, uniting them to him by his Spirit, forgiving them their birth-sin through Christs obedience, although they be not baptized? As corrupt as the Schoolmen were, they could say, *Gratia Dei non alligatur Sacramentis*, The grace of God is not tyed to Sacraments. If most of the Anabaptists hold universall grace, and free-will, there may be as much said of most of the pædobaptists, taking in a great part of the Papists, almost all the *Lutherans*, and *Arminians*, and if they

they denyed originall ſin, it is their dangerous error, but it is not conſequent on their denying Pædobaptiſme. But the late confeſsion of faith made in the name of 7. Churches of them in *London*, *Art.* 4, 5, 21, 22, 23, 24 26. will abundantly anſwer for them in this point of *Pelagianiſme*. The third is, "*Or that although they be tainted with* "*originall corruption, and ſo need a Saviour, Chriſt doth* pro bene pla- "cito, *ſave ſome of the infants of Turks and Indians dying in their in-* "*fancy, as well as ſome of the infants of Chriſtians, and ſo carry ſal-* "*vation by Chriſt out of the Church beyond the Covenant of grace* "*where God never made any promiſe*. Nor doth this follow: for it may be ſaid, all that dye in their infancy are not damned, nor all ſaved becauſe they have no birth-ſin, nor ſome of the Indians ſaved. For the ſome that may be ſaved, may be the infants of believers, to whom God may forgive their birth-ſin, without baptiſme. Thus you may perceive, how the puſh of all the horns of your horned Syllogiſme may be avoyded. But you conceive it a great abſurdity to ſay, "*That* "*Chriſt doth* pro bene placito *ſave ſome of the infants of Indians*: it is true, it is a bold ſaying, to ſay he doth ſave them, but 'tis as bad to ſay that God may not ſave them *pro bene placito*, according to his good pleaſure. *He hath mercy on whom he will have mercy*. But *that* "*ſalvation by Chriſt is carried out of the Church, where he hath made* "*no promiſe*: if you mean by the Church, the inviſible Church of the elect, the Church of the firſt-born that are written in heaven, of which Proteſtant Divines, as *Morton de Eccleſia*, and others againſt *Bellarmine* underſtand that ſaying, *Extra Eccleſiam non eſt ſalus* without the Church is no ſalvation: then it follows not, that if the infants of Indians be ſaved, ſalvation is carryed without the Church for they may be of the inviſible Church of the elect, to whom belongs the promiſe made to *Abraham*, *I will be thy God, and the God of thy ſeed*. But if you mean it of the viſible, though I diſclaim *Zuinglius* his opinion (who was a ſtiffe aſſertor of Pædobaptiſme, and I think the founder of the new way of maintaining it, by the new addition to the Covenant of grace) that *Hercules*, *Ariſtides*, *Socrates*, *Numa*, and ſuch like heathens are now in heaven; yet I cannot ſay no perſons without the communion of the viſible Church are ſaved. He that could call *Abraham* in *Ur* of *Chaldea*, *Job* in the land of *Uz* and *Rahab* in *Jericho*, may ſave ſome amongſt Turks and Indians out of the viſible Church. You will not call *Rome* a true viſible Church nor will you, I think, ſay, that all are damned that are in *Rome*. You

adde

adde, "*That God hath made a promise to be the God of believers and* "*of their seed, we all know.* If you know it, yet I professe my ignorance of such a promise; I reade indeed of a promise made to *Abraham, That he would be his God, and the God of his seed*, and I reade *That they that are of the faith of Abraham, are the children of Abraham, Gal.*3.7.29. *Rom* 4.11,12,13,16. But I am yet to seek for that promise you speake of, to be the God of believers and their seed. You say, "*But where the promise is to be found, that he will be the* "*God of the seed of such Parents who live and die his enemies, and their* "*seed not so much as called by the preaching of the Gospel, I know not.* Nor do I. Only I know this, *I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion*, Rom. 9. 15. which is the Apostles answer in this very case. Thus have I entred your out-works, I shall now try the strength of your walls, I mean the third part of your Sermon.

Infant-baptisme cannot be deduced from holy Scripture.

PART. III.

Concerning the Arguments from Scripture for Infant-baptism.

§. 1. Of the connexion between the covenant and the seale.

"You say, *My first argument is, his, The Infants of* "*believing parents are* fœderati, *therefore they must* "*be* signati : *They are within the Covenant of* "*Grace belonging to Christs body, Kingdome, Fa-* "*mily, therefore are to partake of the seal of his co-* "*venant, or the distinguishing badge between them* "*who are under the Covenant of grace, and them* "*who are not. The ordinary answer to this argument, is by denying* "*that Infants are under the Covenant of grace, only some few deny the* "*consequence, that although they were within the Covenant, yet it fol-* "*lows not that they must be sealed, because say they, the women among* "*the Jews were under the covenant, yet received not circumcision,* "*which was the seal of the Covenant.*

They that deny the consequence of your argument, do it justly, for the consequence must be proved by this universall: All that are *fœderati*, must be *signati*, all that are in the covenant of Grace must be sealed, which is not true. If it were true, it must be so, either by reason of some necessary connexion between the termes, which is none for it is but a common accident to a man that hath a promise or a covenant made to him, that he should have a speciall sign, it may *adesse vel abesse a subjecto*, it may be present, or absent from the subject. God made a speciall promise to *Joshuah*, that he should bring *Israel* into the Land of *Canaan*; to *Phineas* a covenant of an everlasting Priesthood, without any speciall sign or seal distinct from the Covenant; or else it must be so by reason of Gods will declared concerning the covenant of Grace, but that is not true. The promise made to *Adam*, which you confesse was the same in substance with the covenant of Grace, had no speciall sign or seal annexed to it; *Noah Abel* were within the covenant of Grace, yet no speciall sign appointed them, therefore it is not Gods will that all that are *fœderat* in the Covenant, must be *signati*, Sealed; if they had been *signati* though they were *fœderati*, it had been will-worship, God not appointing it to them. But you will say, all that are *fœderati* should be *signati*, since the solemn Covenant with *Abraham*. But neither is this certain, sith we finde no such thing concerning *Melchizedeck*, and *Lot*, that lived in *Abrahams* time, nor concerning *Job*, that it's conceived lived after his time. You will say, but it is true of all the *fœderati* in *Abrahams* family: but neither is that true, for male children before the eighth day, and women, though federate, yet were not to be signed. So that you see it is so far from being universally true, that all that are *fœderati*, must be *signati*; that this is all which is true, all the male children of *Abrahams* family, if they were eight dayes old, must be signed with the sign of Circumcision, which never will be able to prove the consequence of your Enthymeme according to true Logick.

" *But you say this receives an easie answer, the women were circum-*
" *cised in the males, else God could not have said, that the whole hous-*
" *of* Israel *were circumcised in the flesh, else could not the Whole Nati-*
" *on of the Jews be called the Circumcision, in opposition to all th-*
" *world besides, Who were called the Uncircumcision.*

'Tis true, the answer you give *is an easie answer*, because easie to be answered, but it is not a sufficient answer, to take away the exceptio-

gainſt that univerſall propoſition which muſt prove the conſequence
f your Enthymeme: The anſwer is, *That women were circumciſed
n the males.* You expreſſe it thus, pag. 28. where you repeat the ſame
hing. *This ſign was actually applyed only to the males, yet the females
ere virtually circumciſed in them*: So this is your meaning. The
vomen were not circumciſed at all, yet that the males were circum-
iſed, it was all one as if they had been circumciſed in their perſons.
Now then let us ſcan this anſwer: the concluſion to be proved was,
hat Infants were to be ſealed actually, not virtually. For if a virtuall
ealing, or baptizing were all that you would prove, we might grant
; we may ſay infants are virtually baptized in their parents, and yet
t may be unlawfull to baptize them actually; as it would have been
nlawfull to have circumciſed women actually, notwithſtanding their
irtuall circumciſion. For it had been a will-worſhip, there being no
ommand to do it. And indeed, to ſpeak exactly, women were not
ircumciſed virtually in the males; for he is ſaid virtually to have a
hing by ar o her, as by a Proxie, or Attorny, that might receive it
y himſelfe, yet *quoad effectum juris*, according to the effect of Law,
nothers receiving is as if he had received it: but ſo the males did not
eceive circumciſion for the females, for the females might not be
ircumciſed in their own perſons, it had been their ſin, if they had re-
ieved it, God not appointing it: As it had been a ſin for a childe to
e circumciſed afore or after the eighth day, in them that altered or
werved from the appointment of God: Now then this being the
oncluſion to be proved, That infants of believing parents are to be
ctually ſigned or ſealed, the propoſition muſt be meant of the ſame
igning or ſealing, and the Syllogiſme thus framed. All that are *fœde-
rati*, muſt be actually *ſignati*. All the infants of believers are *fœderati*,
Ergo, All the infants of believers muſt be actually *ſignati*: If you do
not thus frame your Syllogiſme, but put in the propoſition virtually
ſigned, and in your concluſion actually ſigned, your Syllogiſme hath
four termes, and ſo is naught. If you do not put actually ſigned in the
concluſion, you conclude not that which you ſhould prove. Now this
alſo occaſions me to note another fault in your argument, to wit, your
concluding that which was not the queſtion, which was not of any
ſign indefinitely, but of baptiſme. You cannot ſay it is all one, for
there are other ſignes of the Covenant beſides baptiſme, as circum-
ciſion of old, ſo the Lords Supper now. If then I ſhould grant the
concluſion, That infants of believers are to be *ſignati*, yet you would

say they are not to be partakers of the Lords Supper, because it is not appointed for them. So in like manner if it were granted you, that infants of believers are to be signed, yet it follows not that they are to be baptized unless you can prove it is appointed to them; and the truth is, if it were granted, that children were *fœderati*, yet it were a high presumption in us to say, therefore they must be *signati*, without Gods declaration of his minde, and if it were granted they must be *signati*, it were in like manner a high presumption in us to say, therefore they must be baptized, without Gods declaration of his minde concerning that Ordinance. Though it may be good to argue thus, it is Gods minde, therefore it is to be done; yet it is a great pride of spirit for us to argue, This should be, therefore God hath appointed it. As for the reasons you bring to prove that women were virtually circumcised in the males, they prove it not, for when it is said *The whole house of Israel were circumcised in the flesh*, the sense is not, every person is either actually, or virtually circumcised, but all the house of *Israel* is put for a great part, or the greater, or the most eminent, as it is frequently elswhere, 1 *Sam.* 7. 3. *Act.* 2. 36. *Act.* 13. 24. as the whole Church is said to come together, when the most of them come together. And in the like manner the people of the Jews may be called the *Circumcision*, from the greater or more famous part; though the women be neither actually nor virtually circumcised. As a field of wheat may be called from the greater or most eminent part; as a Church of believers, from the greater or most eminent part, though the rest be neither actually nor virtually believers. And for your other reason, *pag.* 28. "*It was Gods expresse order*, Exod. 12. 28. "*No uncircumcised person might eat of the Passeover, which we are* "*sure women did, as well as men, therefore they were virtually circumcised*; Neither is this cogent. For, the Proposition is thus to be limited, *pro subjecta materia*, according to the subject matter. No uncircumcised person might eat thereof, that ought to be circumcised: Now women were not appointed to be circumcised at all, therefore they need not either actually to be circumcised, or to have any circumcised for them, or in their stead, which you mean (I think) by virtuall circumcision. Now I have dwelt so long on your Consequence, because I still stick at this, That no reason of ours in positive worship, can acquit an action that is performed from will-worship. Nothing but Gods will, manifest in his institution, gathered by some command or example now in force, can do it. Nevertheless, because

I conceive the Antecedent of your Enthymeme is not true, though your Argument be overthrown by shewing the invalidity of your Consequence, I shal proceed to examine your 5 Conclusions, by which you endeavor to make good both your antecedent, & whole argument.

§. 2. Of the first conclusion concerning the identity of the Covenant of grace for substance to Jews and Gentiles.

YOur first conclusion is this, "*That the Covenant of grace for* "*substance, hath always bin one & the same to Jews and Gentiles.* This conclusion I grant: but on sundry passages in the proofe of it, I think it necessary to make these animadversions. 1. You carry the narration of the Covenant made with *Abraham*, Gen. 17. as if it did only contain the covenant of Grace in Christ, whereas it is apparent out of the Text, that the Covenant was a mixt Covenant, consisting of temporall benefits, to wit, the multiplying of his seed, *v.* 6. the possession of Canaan, *v.* 8. the birth of *Isaac*, *v.* 16. and the spirituall blessings, *v.* 5, 7. Yea, *Cameron the sibus de triplici fœdere Dei, thes.* 78. saith, *That circumcision did primarily separate* Abrahams *seed from other Nations, sealed the earthly promise, it signified sanctification secondarily.* And indeed this is so plainly delivered in the Scripture, that the Psalmist cals the promise of Canaan, the covenant made with *Abraham*, *Ps.* 105. 8, 9, 10, 11. *He hath remembred his Covenant for ever, the Word which he commanded to a thousand generations, which Covenant he made with Abraham, and his Oath unto Isaac, and confirmed the same to Jacob for a Law, and to Israel for an everlasting covenant; Saying, unto thee will I give the Land of Canaan, the lot of your inheritance.* If you should say that these promises were types of spirituall and heavenly things, the reply is, that though it be true, yet the things promised were but carnall and earthly, as the Sacrifices were but carnall things, though shadowes of spirituall. 2. When you say thus: "*The manner of administration of this Covenant, was at first by types and shadowes, and sacrifices, &c.* It had been convenient to have named Circumcision, that it might not be conceived to belong to the substance of the Covenant. But of this there may be more occasion to speak at *pag.* 35. of your Sermon. 3. Whereas, *pag.* 14. you place *among the third sort of Abrahams seed,* "*Proselytes, that were selfe-justitiaries, carnall and formall professors:* it behoved you to shew, where in Scripture they are called Abrahams seed, which I think you cannot. Yea, the truth is, you herein joyn with *Arminius*, who in his Analysis of the 9. to the Romans, makes this as the ground of his wresting that Scripture, that there is a seed of Abraham mentioned, *Romans* 4. 9, 10. and *Galat.* 3. & 4. *cap.*

Qui

Qui per opera legis justitiam & salutem consequuntur, Who follow after righteousnesse and salvation by the works of the Law. To whom *Baine* on *Eph.*1.5. *p.*139. answers. *Beside, though the sons of the flesh may signifie such, who carnally, not spiritually conceive of the Law; yet the seed of Abraham without any adjoyned, is never so taken.* But it is yet stranger to me, that which Mr. *Blake* hath, *pag.*9. where he saith, "*That there yet remaines in the bosome of the Church, a di-*'*stinction of the seed of Abraham, borne after the flesh, and after the* '*spirit. And that now by vertue of being born after the flesh, some* '*have a Church-interest.* And applies that of *Gal.*4 29. *Even so it is* '*now, to children born of believing parents after the flesh as having there* '*by title to Church-interest.* Which passages are very grosse, though he makes this the medium of his fourth Argument. For, first, whereas the Apostle, by being *born after the flesh*, means not infants born of believing parents, but those that are under the covenant of Mount *Sinai*, that is, who sought righteousnesse by the law, and not by faith: Mr. *Blake* means, by being born after the flesh, birth by naturall generation of infants born of Christian parents. 2 Whereas he saith, *that such are in the bosome of the Church*; the Apostle saith, *they persecute the Church, and are cast out.* 3. Whereas he makes such *Abrahams* seed, he therein joyns with *Arminius*, against the truth, and against the Apostle: for though the Apostle makes *Ismael* to be the son of *Abraham*, and speaks of him as *born after the flesh*, whom he typically makes to represent legall justitiaries; yet doth he not call *Abrahams* seed simply such justitiaries. 4. Whereas the *covenant of grace* is made the reason of baptizing infants, by alleaging this place for baptizing of infants; To be born of *Hagar*, that is, to be in the *covenant of works*, should give a child interest into the Church of Christ. For my part, I can see no other consequence than this, of that cloudy argument. The rest of your explication of the first Conclusion, I let passe without any further animadversions, as being unwilling *sectare minutias*, to insist on small things, or to stand upon matters of expression, where I think you mean right, and your words are likely to be so taken.

§. 3. Of the meaning of the second Conclusion.

YOur second Conclusion is this: "*Ever since God gathered a di-*"*stinct number out of the World, to be his Kingdom, City, house-*"*hold, in opposition to the rest of the world, which is the kingdome, city,* "*and houshold of Sathan; He would have the Infants of all who are*

"*taken*

"*taken into Covenant with him, to be accounted his, to belong to him,*
"*to his Church and family, and not to the Devils.*

This Concluſion you expreſſe ſo ambiguouſly, that it is a *Cothurnus*, a buskin that may be put on either legge, right or left, which ſhould not have been in the main Propoſition upon which the whole frame of your Argument hings. You ſay, "*The Infants of all who are* "*taken into covenant with God, are to be accounted his*; but you tell us not in what ſenſe this is to be underſtood. For whereas perſons may be ſaid to be accounted his, either before God, or *in facie Eccleſiæ viſibilis*, in the face of the viſible Church; 1. Before God, either in reſpect of his election from eternity, or his promiſe of grace in Chriſt, congruous to it; Or of their preſent eſtate of inbeing in Chriſt, or the future eſtate they ſhall have. 2. *In facie Eccleſiæ viſibilis*, perſons may be ſaid to be accounted God's, either as born among his people, and ſo potentially members of the Church, as being in a way to be in time actuall members of the Church of Chriſt, or who already enquire after God, and profeſſe Chriſt, though they do not well underſtand the doctrine of Chriſtian Religion, ſuch as the *Catechumeni* of old were: or they are to be accounted his, in reſpect of actuall participation of Baptiſme, and the Lords ſupper. 3. The accounting of them to be God's, may be either an act of ſcience, or faith, or opinion; and that grounded on a rule of charity, of prudence, or probable hope for the future. You do not declare diſtinctly in which of theſe ſenſes or reſpects, the Infants of all who are taken into covenant with God, are to be accounted his; ſo that I am almoſt at a ſtand, what to deny, or grant. It cannot be denied, but God would have the infants of believers in ſome ſort to be accounted his, to belong to him, his Church and family, and not to the Devils, (which expreſſion I fear you uſe in this and other places, *ad faciendum populum*, to pleaſe the people.) It is true, *in facie Eccleſiæ viſibilis*, the infants of believers are to be accounted Gods, to belong to his family and church, and not to the Devils, as being in a neer poſſibility of being members of the church of God, by an act of opinion grounded on probable hopes for the future: But to make them actually members of the viſible Church, is to overthrow the definitions of the viſible Church, that Proteſtant writers give, particularly the Church of *England*, *Art.* 19. who make the *viſible Church a number of Chriſtians by profeſſion:* to make a member of the viſible Church, to whom the note of a member of the viſible Church doth not agree; to make them viſible members

The anſwer of the Aſſembly of Divines to the reaſons of the 7 diſſenting brethren, p. 48 præcog. 1. *The whole Church of Chriſt is but one, made up of the collection and aggregation of all who are called out of the world by the preaching of the Word, to profeſſe the faith of Chriſt.*

members that are only passive, and do nothing, by which they may be denominated visible Christians. Yea, it will follow, that there may be a visible Church, which consists only of Infants of believers; for a number of visible members, makes a visible Church. It is also true, that we are not to account Infants of believers to belong to God, before God, in respect of election from eternity, or promise of grace in Christ, or present estate of in-being in Christ, or future estate by any act of science or of faith, without a particular revelation: for there is no generall declaration of God, that the Infants of present believers indefinitely all, or some, either are elected to life, or are in the covenant of grace in Christ, either in respect of present inbeing, or future estate.

Mr. *Cotton*, [The Covenant of Gods free-grace, p. 15.] *Fifthly, it is ordered in regard of the persons to whom it is given*, Gal. 3. 16. *It was given to Christ, and in Christ to every godly man*, Gen. 17. 7. *and in every godly man to his seed; God will have some of the seed of every godly man to stand before him for ever.*

Against this passage I except, That when he saith, *that the covenant of grace is given in every godly man to his seed*; he expresseth himself in an unusuall phrase, so obscurely, that his meaning is not easily conceived. For when he saith, *it is given in every godly man*; If he mean it as he said in the words next before, *in Christ to every godly man*, that every godly man should be to his seed, as Christ to every godly man; this were to make every godly man a mediator to his seed, as Christ is to every godly man, which would be blasphemy. If he mean that every godly man is a root of the Covenant, as *Abraham*, it is most false, sith this is proper to *Abraham* alone, to be the *father of the faithfull*, Rom. 4. 11. And the *root that beares the branches*, whether naturall, or ingrafted, *Rom.* 11. 16. &c. And when he saith, *it is given to his seed*, he speaks indefinitely, which may be understood universally to all his seed, which is most manifestly false; or else particularly, as the words following seem to import: But neither is this true, as shall be presently shewed. Nor doth he tell us whether the covenant of grace be given to the godly mans seed, absolutely as his seed; which if he affirm, then he must affirm the covenant of grace is given to all the seed of every godly man: for, *Quatenus ipsum includes de omni*, That which is said of any thing, as such, agrees to all that are such. Or whether it be given conditionally. Now it is true, that some promises do suppose a condition, as justification presupposeth believing:

And

and if this be the meaning, the Covenant of grace is given to every godly man, and in every godly man to his seed, if they do believe, then it is no more then the Covenant of grace is given to every godly man, and then it is but trifling to adde, *and in every godly man to his seed*, sith nothing more is expressed, but what was said before, nor any thing convayed from the godly man to his seed; some promises have no condition, as the promise of *writing Gods Laws in our hearts*, for if any condition be put, we shall fall into *Pelagianisme*, that grace is given according to our merits. 2. That which he saith, he saith without any proofe at all, yea, contrary to the expresse words of the Apostle, *Rom.* 4. 11, 12, 13. *Rom.* 9. 6, 7, 8. *Gal.* 3. 7, 14, 29. who limiteth this promise, *Gen.* 17. 7. to the seed of *Abraham*, and the seed of *Abraham* he explains to be the elect, and believers only, whether of Jews or Gentiles, and those of the Jews that are in that Covenant, not to be in that Covenant, because *Abrahams* naturall seed (though God have more regard in his election and covenant of grace to *Abrahams* naturall seed, then to any other godly mans naturall seed that hath been since) but as his seed by calling. And for that which he saith, *God will have some of the seed of every godly man to stand before him for ever*, meaning this, as I conceive, of election and covenant of grace, or some state consequent upon these, it is but a bold dictate without proofe, imposing on Gods counsell and covenant, especially sith God hath declared so expresly after the Covenant, *Gen.* 17. 7. *That he will have mercy on whom he will have mercy*. Exod. 33. 19. whence the Apostle infers, *Rom.* 9. 18. an unlimited freedome notwithstanding his Covenant to *Abraham*, *to shew mercy on whom he will*, any other being passed by: and therefore that promise was made good to *Abraham* in the calling of the Gentiles, *Rom.* 9. 24. *Rom.* 4 16, 17. yea, *John Baptist* saith, *That God could raise up children to* Abraham *out of stones*, Mat. 3. 9. And for the thing it selfe, it is not true, *That God will have some of the seed of every godly man to stand before him for ever*. For millions of godly persons die childlesse, as *Abel*, *&c.* millions that have children, yet their posterity are rooted up. Were there not other godly persons from *Seth* to *Noah*, besides those mentioned in the Genealogy *Gen.* 5. yet it is certain that none of their seed stood before God at the time of the Flood but *Noah*, and some of his. Is it not more likely that none of *Elies* children, or *Samuels* stood before God in Mr. *Cottons* sense? Besides, if that which Mr. *Cotton* saith were true, how is it that the Candlestick

is removed quite from some people, and the naturall branches broken off, and the branches besides nature, even of the wilde Olive, graffed into the true Olive? Then, suppose a godly man have but one childe, that 'childe must infalliby stand before God. It is said indeed *Jer.*35.19. and Mr. *Cotton* seems to allude to it, *Jonadab the son of Rechab shall not want a man to stand before me for ever.* But this standing before God is not meant of election to eternall life, and the covenant of grace, but of preservation in the destruction of Jerusalem, and being after the Captivity of *Babylon Scribes*, as *Junius annot. in Jerem.* 35. 19. gathers from 1 *Chron.* 2. 55. and *for ever* is in many places meant of a temporall duration for some ages. This digression will not be thought unnecessary by those that know how apt many are to swallow down such mens dictates without examination. But I proceed.

Nor are we to account Infants of believers by an act of opinion according to a rule of prudence, by which the Sacraments are to be administred, to belong to God *in facie Ecclesiæ visibilis*, in respect of outward profession, as the *Catechumeni*, or participation of baptisme and the Lords Supper, as compleat Christians. And as for being accounted by an act of opinion according to a rule of charity to belong to God, it hath no place in this matter. For judging of mens present estate by a rule of charity, is when men judge of others the best, that their words and works may be interpreted to signifie, according to that of the Apostle, 1 *Cor.* 13.7. *Charity believes all things*: But infants do not shew any thing by words or works that may signifie their thoughts, and therefore in respect of them, whether they be good or bad, we can have no judgement, but must only suspend our act of judging them. But if by judgement of charity be meant, as some expresse it, conceiving a thing to be so, because we know nothing to the contrary, then are we to conceive all infants to belong to God, yea almost all men in the world by the judgement of charity, because for ought we know to the contrary, all may be elected. Wherefore I must either here stop, or else gather your meaning by your expressions in other parts of your Sermon, and the expresions of those with whom I conceive you concurre in opinion; and therefore if I should not exactly light on your meaning, you are to thank your selfe, but not to blame me. This is then that which I conceive you meane. That in the promise which God made to *Abraham*, *That he would be his God, and the God of his seed,*

as

as this promise comprehends Evangelicall blessings, the infants of believers are comprehended, and therefore they are *fœderati*, taken into Covenant with their Parents. And yet I am at a stand, whether, when you say they are taken into Covenant with their Parents, and that the promise, *I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed*, belongs to them in respect of Evangelicall blessings, you mean it in respect of saving graces, or the priviledge of outward Ordinances, though the latter is no more true then the former, yet it is lesse dangerous, and sometimes your expressions incline me to think you mean no more, especially that which you say pag. 13. *Secondly, All true believers are Abrahams seed*, Gal. 3.29. *These only are made partakers of the spirituall part of the Covenant*, nevertheless, because the most of your expressions carry it thus, that you conceive that God hath promised according to the Covenant with *Abraham, I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed*, to be the God of the naturall seed of believers, in respect of the saving benefits of the Covenant of grace in Christ, and your proofes tend that way. I shall oppose that assertion. But that I may not be thought to wrong you, or *cum larvis luctari*, to fight with a vizour, the reasons why I conceive you mean, or at least your readers are likely to take your meaning so, are these, you say pa. 8. *My first argument is, They are within the Covenant of grace belonging to Christs body, kingdome, family, therefore are to partake of the seal of his Covenant, or the distinguishing badge betweenthem who are under the Covenant of grace, and them who are not.* Pag. 9. You expresse your second conclusion thus. *God will have the Infants of such as enter into Covenant with him, to be accounted his, as well as their Parents*: You set downe the substance of the Covenant of Grace. pag. 10. to consist in those benefits, and then you often say, *The children are in the Covenant of grace with their believing Parents*: and pag. 31. You reject the asserting to the Infants of believers priviledges peculiar to some, and assert the priviledges belonging to the Covenant of grace, *which all that are in Covenant may claime*, which you say, *God made to Abraham, and all his seed.* Besides, your Texts you produce tend to prove that, as *Acts* 2.39. &c. and you say, pag. 15. *They shall be made free of Gods City, according to Abrahams Copy, I will bee thy God, and the God of thy seed*, which in respect of us Gentiles, can have no other meaning, then in respect of justification, sanctification, and salvation, & p. 16. speaking of *Zacheus*, you

say, *Let him professe the faith of Christ, and the Covenant of salvation comes to his house, for now he is made a son of* Abraham, *that is,* Abrahams *promise now reacheth him.* And pag.26. *The proving of the two first conclusions gains the whole cause, if the Covenant be the same, and children belong to it, then they are to be owned as Covenanters.* pag.37. *The Whole Covenant of grace, containing all the promises, whereof this is one,* viz. *That God will be the God of believers, and of their seed; that the seed of believers are taken into Covenant with their parents. This is a part of the Gospel preached unto* Abraham, *and the Apostles were to baptize them, that is, to administer baptisme as a seal of the Covenant, to all those who received the Covenant.* And Master *Vines* in his Sermon, *pag.*19. cals them *confederates with their believing parents,* and Mr. *Blake* pag.16. *God promises to be a God in Covenant to his and their seed, which people in Covenant have also a promise from him of the Spirit.* Nor do I doubt but that your meaning is agreeable to the Directory, which directs the Minister at Baptisme to teach, *That the promise is made to believers, and their seed,* which promise, what it is, appears by the words following, *make this baptisme to the infant a seal of adoption, remission of sins, regeneration, and eternall life, and of all other promises of the Covenant of grace.* And the truth is, although in some passages, (especially Mr. *Blake*) you speak more warily, as if you would avow only a Covenant for outward priviledges, as when Mr. *Blake* saith pag.14. *This birth-right intitles only to outward priviledges,* yet in applying those Texts, *Gen.* 17.7. *Act.*2.39. *Mat.*19.14. and others, you are inforced to expresse your selves, as if you meant the Covenant whereby salvation is promised by Christ, as knowing that those Texts you produce, do otherwise speak nothing to the purpose, being plainly meant of saving graces; and the Covenant now of the Gospel is not of outward priviledges, as the mixt Covenant made with *Abraham* was, and therefore if there be not a promise of saving graces to Infants, they are not now under an Evangelicall Covenant of free grace, and that baptism seals only the promise of saving grace, remission of sins, &c. and therefore if there be not a promise of saving grace to infants, in vain are they baptized, the seal is put to a blank, as some use to speak: And if that there be no covenant of saving grace, to no end is so much weight laid on this for the comfort of parents, and such an Odium cast on Anti-pædobaptists for denying it, and therefore I see not but your assertion, if you do not revoke your plea for pædobaptisme,

must

ruſt be conceived thus ; That God hath made a Covenant or promiſe of ſaving grace in Chriſt, not only to believers, but alſo to their ſeed, whom you baptize for this reaſon. "The Author of the little 'book intituled Infants baptizing proved lawfull by Scripture, *pag.* '3,4 5. *Interprets the Covenant, I will be thy God, and the God of* 'thy ſeed, thus, *I will be the God of every believer, and the God of e-* 'very believers ſeed in reſpect of outward Church-priviledges, to be 'members of the viſible Church, partakers of baptiſme, &c. to the na- 'turall ſeed, in reſpect of inward and meerly ſpirituall, to none but 'true Saints, in whom the new creature is formed. But I ſay againe [*Abraham*] or [*thee*] in that Covenant is put only for *Abraham*, and not for every believer. For ſith the Apoſtle plainly interprets believers to be *Abrahams* ſeed, *Rom.*4.13,16. *Gal.*3.29.to ſay *Abraham* is put for any believer, makes the ſpeech to have an inept autology, *I will be the God of Abraham*, that is, of every believer, ccording to that Authors ſenſe ; and *I will be the God of thy ſeed*,that s, of every believer, according to the Apoſtles ſenſe. And that in hat Covenant ſhould be a promiſe to us believing Gentiles, *That to ur ſeed ſhould be conferred viſible Church priviledges, to be members f the viſible Church, partakers of baptiſme, &c.* is but a dream, the cripture no where explaining it ſo, and being ſo underſtood, were ot true, there being many of the ſeed of believers,that neither *de facto*, in event, nor *de jure*, of right, have thoſe viſible Church priviledges, to be members of the viſible Church, partakers of bap.iſme, &c. and if there were ſuch a promiſe, God could not take away the Candleſtick from the poſterity of believers, which he threatens, *Rev.* 2.5. George Philips, vind.of Infant bapt. p.37. Cals the Covenant, *an offer to become their God*, and all along ſuppoſeth infants under the Covenant,becauſe grace was offered in circumciſion; and they ſealed, becauſe it was offered. But the Covenant is not an offer, but a promiſe ; nor is a man under the Covenant of grace, or in the Covenant of grace, becauſe an offer is made, for then refuſers might be ſaid to be under the Covenant,but becauſe God hath promiſed, or performed to them. And if infants are to be baptized (which is his ground) becauſe the Covenant is offered to them in baptiſme, then in effect, it is to argue, they are to be baptized, becauſe they are to be baptized, which is nugatory. I have diſcuſſed this matter more fully,that I may ſhew you how doubtfull your ſpeeches are, and give you the reaſon, why I ſet down this as your concluſion to be denyed by me. *That the*

Covenant of saving grace in Christ, expressed Gen. 17. 7. *In these words* [*I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed*] *is made to believers and their naturall seed.* Now I will shew you the reason why I take this to be an error, and that very dangerous.

§. 4. That the Covenant of grace is not made to believers and their seed.

MY first reason is taken from the Apostle. *Rom. 9. 6* &c. in which place this very Text that is now the apple of our contention, was brought into question; *Beza* thus expresseth the question. *Qui fieri possit ut rejectus sit Israel, quin simul constituendum videatur irritum esse pactum Dei cum Abrahamo, & ejus semine sancitum.* I deny not, but there was also some other promise included in that objection, to wit, some promise made to Israel, or the house of Israel, probably that *Jer.* 31. 33. 36 37. for so the words *ver.* 6. *They are not all Israel which are of Israel*, do intimate.

But without question the promise made to *Abraham*, Gen. 17. 7. was one which was included in that objection. *Beza*, *Twisse*, *Ames*, and others, answering *Arminius*, call it the Covenant of God with *Abraham*, which was that *Gen.* 17. 7. and the very phrase of *Abrahams* seed, *In Isaac shall thy seed be called*, ver. 7. *The children of the promise are counted for the seed*, ver. 8. *Sarah shall have a son*, ver. 9. do evidently shew, that the promise objected to prove, that if the Jews were rejected from being Gods people, then God failed in making good his word, was, that promise to *Abraham*, *I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed.* Whereto I may adde, that the Answerers of *Arminius*, and the cited Remonstrants, to wit, *Baine* and *Ames* do say, *It was the Word of promise, not of the Law*, as *Arminius* conceived, for *the word of promise* saith *Ames*, Animadv. in Remonstran. script. Synod. de præfest. cap. 8. Sect. 4. *Is distinguished and opposed to the words of the Law*, Gal. 3. 17, 18. *Now the word of the promise there, is to Abraham and his seed*, ver. 16. *and this is there called by him* verbum fœderis, *the word of the Covenant.* Now let us consider how the Apostle answers it. He denies that Gods word made to *Abraham* did fall, though the Jews were rejected: because that promise, *I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed*, as it com-

Twisse vind. Grat. cont. Armin. lib. 1. pa. 1. digr. 7. *Hujus autem promissionis* (Gen. 17. 7, 8.) *fides confestim apparet in discrimen adducti ex rejectione Judæorum & exclusione eorundem ex fœdere Dei, cum sint ex Abrahamo secundum carnem prosminati; sic inquit apparet primus rerum facies intuentibus.*

Walæ cont. Corvin. cap. 15. pag. 377. *Apostolus ostendit, ideo verbum fœderis & divinarum promissionum Israelitis factarum, non excidere aut irritum fieri, licet magna Judæorum pars esset incredula, quia promissiones illæ fœderis factæ sunt a Deo, non iis proprie qui ex semine Abrahami secundum carnem erant orituri sed iis qui secundum electionem gratuitam Abrahami familiæ ex vi divinæ promissionis erant inserendi.*

ōprehended saving grace, was never meant by God of all *Abrahams* osterity, or of any barely, as they were descended from *Abraham* y natural generation, but of the Elect, whether descended by natural eneration from *Abraham*, or not. And this is apparent both from the vords, v.7. *Neither becauſe they are the ſeed of Abraham are they all hildren, but in Iſaac ſhall thy ſeed be cal-ed, &c.* v.8. It is expounded thus: *That s, they which are the children of the fleſh, heſe are not the children of God, but the hildren of the promiſe are counted for the eed;* Whence it is apparent, that the ame are not alwayes the ſeed by calling, vhich are the ſeed of *Abraham* by natu-all generation, and that the children of he fleſh are not the ſame with the chil-ren of promiſe, and that the Apoſtle onceived this the right way of anſwering thoſe that objected, the alling of Gods word upon the rejection of the Jews, by reſtraining he promiſe, of being God to *Abrahams* ſeed, only to the Elect, whe-her of *Abrahams* naturall poſterity, or not, with ſo little reſpect to ny birth-right priviledge, that he not only rejected *Iſmael*, and took *Iſaac*, but alſo *loved Jacob, and hated Eſau*, by propheſie declaring his minde, *the elder ſhall ſerve the younger*, and in this the Apoſtle ac-quits God from unrighteouſneſſe, in that *He hath mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardens*, notwithſtanding his promiſe made to *Abraham* and *Iſrael*, or any birth-right priviledge hey could claime. That I may not be thought to go alone in this, I will recite ſome others concurring with me in this, Dr. *Twiſſe* vind. Grat. l. 1. part. 3. digr. 2. *Argumentū Apoſtoli ad probandū fœdus dei inū cum Abrahamo, non omnes Abrahæ poſteros fimbria ſua compre-hendere ſic ſimpliciter inſtituenoū eſſe cenſemus: Eſavus & Jacobus e-rant ex poſteris Abrahæ, at horū utrūq; non cōplexus eſt Deus fœdere ſuo, cum Abrahamo inito: ergo non omnes poſteros Abrahami. Probatur autem Deum non complexū fuiſſe utrūq; fœdere gratiæ, quia non com-plexus eſt Eſavū majorē, ſed Jacobū minorē.* Bain on *Eph.* 1. 5. p. 138. *He anſwereth the aſſumption of the latter Syllogiſm, by diſtinguiſhing of Iſrael & children, denying that al Iſraelites are that Iſrael to which Gods word belongeth, or that all Abrahams ſeed are thoſe children who God adopted to himſelfe,* v.7. *but ſuch only who were like* Iſaac, *firſt be-gotten by a Word of promiſe, and partakers of the heavenly calling.*

The new Annotations on the Bible, Annot. on *Rom.* 9. 8. The children of the fleſh, &c] *Not all they who are carnally born of* Abraham *by the courſe of nature are the children of God to whom the promiſe of grace was made; but the children of promiſe, that is, thoſe who were born by vertue of the promiſe: thoſe who by Gods ſpeciall grace were adopted (as* Iſaac *by a ſpeciall and ſingular promiſe was begot by* Abraham) *they only are accounted for that ſeed mentioned in the Covenant,* I will be thy God, and the God of thy ſeed.

The

The reason is to be conceived in this manner, the rejecting of such who are not the true Israel, nor belong not to the number of Gods adopted children cannot shake Gods word spoken to Israel *and* Abrahams *seed; but many of the Israelites, and Abrahams seed, are such to whom the word of God belonged not,* ergo, *the word of God is firm, though they be rejected.* Pag. 139. *A childe of the flesh being such a one who descendeth from* Abraham *according to the flesh. For it is most plaine, that these did make them thinke themselves within the compasse of the word, because they were Israelites, and the seed of* Abraham, *in regard of bodily generation propagated from him; and* Arminius *doth decline that, in objecting and answering which, this discourse consisteth. Beside that, though the sons of the flesh may signifie such who carnally, not spiritually conceive of the Law, yet the seed of* Abraham *without any adjoyned, is never so taken. The assumption which is to be proved is this, That many of* Abrahams *seed are such to whom the word belongeth not. The word which belonged not to* Ishmael *and* Esau, *but to* Isaac *and* Jacob *only, and such as were like to them; that word belonged not to many of those who are the seed of* Abraham *and* Israelites: *But the word shewing Gods love, choice, adoption, blessing of* Israel *and* Abrahams *seed, belonged not to* Esau, Ishmael, *and such as they were, but to* Isaac *and* Jacob.

Estius annot. ad Gen. 17.7. *Colligit hinc Calvinus eo ipso quo quis est semen Abrahæ ad eum pertinere promissionem Abrahæ factam: sed responsio manifesta promissionum illam de benedictione spirituali intellectam, non ad carnale semen Abrahami pertinere, sed ad spirituale, quemadmodum eam ipse Apostolus interpretatus est,* Rom. 4 & 9. *Si enim carnale semen intelligas jam ad neminem ex gentibus illa promissio pertinebit sed ad solos ex Abraham & Isaac secundum carnem genitos.*

Paræus Comment. in Mat. 3.9 *Docet quoque promissiones Dei non alligatas esse carnali origini: sed pertinere tantum ad posteros fideles & spirituales. Non enim sunt filii Abrahæ qui secundum carnem sunt ex Abraham, sed qui secundum spiritum.*

Amesius Animadv. in Remonstr. citat. scripta Synod. de Prædestin. cap. 8. § 6. thus expresseth the Apostles scope. *Multi sunt ex semine Abrahami, ad quos verbum promissionis non spectat, ut Ismael, & Ismaelitæ, si autem multi sunt ex semine Abrahami, ad quos verbum promissionis non spectat, tum rejectio multorum Judæorum, qui sunt ex semine Abrahami non irritum facit verbum promissionis.* Out of all which I gather, if the naturall posterity of *Abraham*, were not within the Covenant of grace, by vertue of that promise *Gen.* 17.7. then much lesse are our naturall posterity: but the former is true, *Rom.* 9.6,7,8,9,10,11,12. therefore the latter is true: and the contrary, delivered in that which I conceive your assertion, false. A second reason is this, The Apostles Exposition of the promise shews us best

beſt what is the meaning of it, but the Apoſtle when he expounds the promiſe of God to *Abraham, I will be thy God, and the God of thy ſeed*, as it was a promiſe of ſaving grace, to wit, juſtification, and life, expounds it as belonging to *Abraham*, not as a naturall Father, but as *Father of the faithfull*, whether of the Jews, or the Gentiles, and his ſeed, not his naturall, but his ſpirituall ſeed, Chriſt, and believers, *Rom.*4.11.12,13,14,15 16,17. *Gal.*3.7.16.29. Whence *George Downham* of Juſtification lib.6.cap.6.§.4. ſpeakes thus. *The other promiſes concerning his ſeed are two: The former concerning the multiplication of his ſeed, that he ſhould be a father of a multitude of Nations, namely, in Chriſt, and that he would be a God to him and his ſeed, he doth not ſay to ſeeds, as of many, but as of one, to thy ſeed, which is Chriſt*, Gal.3.16. *that is, Chriſt myſticall*, 1 Cor.12.12. *Containing the multitude of the faithfull in all Nations, both Jews and Gentiles. This promiſe therefore implyeth the former, that in Chriſt, the promiſed ſeed*, Abraham *himſelfe, and his ſeed, that is, the faithfull of all Nations ſhould be bleſſed: And in confirmation of this promiſe, he was called* Abraham, *becauſe he was to be a Father of many Nations, that is, of the faithfull of all Nations, for none but they are accounted* Abrahams *ſeed*, Rom.9.7 8. Gal.3.7.29. Thus he opens the Apoſtles meaning, and thus frequently do Proteſtant Divines in their writings. Now if only believers are in that promiſe, as it was a promiſe of ſaving grace, then it is not made to the naturall poſterity, as ſuch, of any believer, much leſſe of us Gentiles.

My third reaſon is this. The Covenant of grace is the Goſpel, and ſo you call it, pag.37. when you ſay, *This is a part of the Goſpel preached unto* Abraham. Now the Goſpel preached to *Abraham*, the Apoſtle thus expreſſeth, Gal.3 8,9. *And the Scripture foreſeeing, that God would juſtifie the heathen through faith, preached before the Goſpel unto Abraham, ſaying, in thee ſhall all Nations be bleſſed: ſo then, they which be of faith, are bleſſed with faithfull* Abraham, and ver.11. *But that no man is juſtified by the Law in the ſight of God, it is evident, for the juſt ſhall live by Faith*, it is Hab.2.4. *By his faith*. And generally, when Divines diſtinguiſh of the Covenant of grace, and of workes, they ſay the condition of the Covenant of grace is faith. They then that ſay the Covenant of grace belongs not only to believers, but alſo to their naturall children, whether believing or not, theſe adde to the Goſpel, and the Apoſtle ſaith of ſuch, *Gal.* 1. 8 9. *Let him be accurſed.*

Ainſworth ann.on Gen. 12.7. *Thy ſeed*] *That is, to all the children of promiſe (the elect) who only are counted Abrahams ſeed*, Rom.9.7,8. *and in Chriſt are heirs by promiſe, as well the Gentiles as the Jews.* Gal. 3.26.28.29. Ames.Coron. art.5.cap.2. *Seminis etiam inculcatio ſolos electos & efficaciter vocatos notari docet Apoſtolo ſic hunc titulum interpretante*, Rom. 9.8.Gal.3.16. & 4.28.

Fourthly, I thus argue: If God have made a Covenant of grace in Christ, not only to believers, but also to their seed, or naturall children, then it is either conditionally, or absolutely; if conditionally, the condition is either of works, and then grace should be of works, contrary to the Apostle, *Rom.* 11.8. or of Faith, and then the sense is, God hath promised grace to believers, and to their seed, if believers, that is, to believers, and believers, which is nugatory. If this Covenant of grace to believers seed be absolutely, then either God keeps it, or not: if he do not keep it, then he breaks his word, which is blasphemy; if he do keep it, then it follows, that all the posterity of believers are saved, contrary to *Rom* 9.13. or if some are not saved, though they be in the Covenant of grace, there may bee Apostasie of persons in the Covenant of grace, by which the Arguments brought by Mr. *Prinne*, in his *Perpetuity*, and others for perseverance in grace are evacuated, and *Bertius* his *Hymenæus defertor* justified. The truth is, generally to be in the Covenant of grace, and to be elect, and to persevere in grace, are meant of the same persons, according to the Apostles doctrine, *Rom.* 9. 7, 8. &c. and the common doctrine of the Contra-Remonstrants. And on the contrary, *Bertius* in his book *de Apostasia sanctorum*, pag.79. among other absurdities which he reckons as consequent on their opinion that deny Apostasie of Saints, puts this as the seventh. *Baptismum non obsignare certo in omnibus liberis fidelium gratiam Dei (quam inter illos quidam sint etiam antecedente decreto Dei ab æterno absolute reprobati) ac proinde dubitandum esse fidelibus de veritate fœderis divini, Ego sum Deus tuus, & seminis tui post te.* And when this was urged by the Author of the Synod of *Dort*, and *Arles* reduced to the practise, Part. 3. Sect. 6. in these words. *For to every person Whom they baptize, they apply the promises of the Covenant of grace, clean contrary to their own doctrine*, which saith, *that they nothing belong to the Reprobates of the world*, Dr. *Twisse* answers, that however in the judgement of charity they take all Infants brought to be baptized, to be elect, yet the promises of the Covenant of grace do indeed belong only to the Elect, which he proves at large, by shewing that there are promises of the Covenant of grace, as of regeneration, circumcising the heart, writing the Law in their hearts, *Jer.* 31.33. which must needs be absolute. For no condition can be assigned of performing these promises, but that it will follow, *That grace is given, to wit, the grace of faith, according to mens Workes, which is plaine Pelagianisme.*

Whence

Whence he concludes. *Now then who are they on whom God should bestow faith and regeneration, but Gods Elect? And accordingly Baptisme as it is a Seale, and assurance of performing this promise of justification and salvation unto them that believe, so it is a seale and assurance of the promise of circumcising the heart, and regeneration only to Gods Elect.* And after pag. 192. *We are ready to maintaine, that all who are under the covenant of grace, are such as over whom sin shall not have the dominion,* Rom. 6. 14.

Besides, he that shall heare you preach, that the children of believers are in the Covenant of grace, and that they that are in the Covenant of grace cannot fall away, may be apt to conceive himselfe within the Covenant of grace without repentance and faith, and that he shall be saved without obedience, and so lay a ground-work for *Antinomianisme*, and consequently Libertinisme. And may not on the other side believing Parents, when they see their children vicious, and ungodly, doubt whether they themselves be true believers, because they see not their children in the Covenant of grace; and so while you think to comfort parents about their children, you may create great discomfort concerning themselves.

Lastly, if this were true, that the Covenant of grace is a birth-right priviledge, then the children of believers are children of grace by nature, for that which is a birth-right priviledge, is a priviledge by nature: and if, as Mr. *Blake* saith, pag. 6. of his book, *Christianity is hereditary, that as the childe of a Noble man is Noble, the childe of a freeman is free, the childe of a Turke is a Turke, of a Jew a Iew, the childe of a Christian is a Christian*; then Christians are born Christians, not made Christians, and how are they then children of wrath by nature? which whether they may not advantage Pelagians, and denyers of Originall sin, it concernes those that use such speeches, to consider.

But the Author of the writing entituled *Infants baptizing proved lawfull by Scripture*, mentions other promises besides that *Gen.* 17. 7. to wit, *Deu.* 28. 4. *Deut.* 30. 2. 6. *Isa.* 44. 3. *Isa.* 59. 21. *Exod.* 20. 6. *Psal.* 112. 2. and such like. To all which the answer is plaine, if men would conceive it. 1. That according to the Apostles own determination, *Ro.* 9. 7, 8. these promises as they contain such things as accompany salvation, must be restrained to the Elect, whose children soever they be by naturall generation, and this is agreeable to our Saviours applying the promise *Isa.* 54. 13. to them that are given of his Father, *Iohn* 6. 45.

And thus are we to understand *Deut.*30.6. *Isa.*44.3. 2. That the text, *Isa.* 59. 21. is plainly applied to the time of the calling of the Jews, *Rom.*11.27. and therefore cannot be applied rightly to the posterity of any believers at any time indefinitely. 3. That the promises, *Deut.*28. 4. *Psal.* 112. 2. are expresly meant of outward blessings, and therefore cannot prove a covenant of grace in Christ. 4. That *Exod.*20.6. doth plainly include a condition of obedience, and it is expresly mentioned *Psal.* 103. 17, 18. as included in other promises of like kind, which condition God doth not undertake for any children of a believer, but the elect, nor is Christ surety for any but the elect; and therefore till it can be proved that the *Election of grace* belongs to the children of believers, it cannot be proved that the *Covenant of grace* belongs to them by vertue of these promises.

§. 5. It is not in Gods church, like other kingdomes.

NOw return to your Sermon. You tell us thus: *As it is in other kingdomes, corporations and families; the children of all subjects born in a kingdom, are born that Princes subjects: Where the father is a free-man, the childe is not born a slave: Where any are bought to be servants, their children born in their masters house, are born his servants. Thus it is by the Lawes of almost all nations, and thus hath the Lord ordained it shall be in his kingdome and family: the children follow the Covenant-condition of their parents; if he take a father into his covenant, he takes the children in with him; if he reject the parents out of the covenant, the children are cast out with them.*

This passage I might have passed over, as containing nothing but dictates; Yet I think it necessary to observe, 1. That you do very carnally imagine the Church of God to be like Civill corporations, as if persons were admitted to it by birth, whereas in this all is done by free election of grace, and according to Gods appointment: nor is God tied, or doth tie himself in the erecting and propagating his Church, to any such carnall respects, as descent from men. Christianity is no mans birth-right; The Apostle knew not that God had so by promise, or other ingagement bound himself, but he was free, as he said to *Moses* after the promise made to *Abraham, to have mercy on whom he would*, Rom. 9. 15. Yea, to conceive that it is in Gods Church, as in other Kingdomes, and after the laws of Nations, is a seminary of dangerous superstitions and errors. Dr. *Rainolds*, in his Conference with *Hart*, hath shewed, that hence arose the frame of government

government by Patriarchs, Metropolitans, &c. And is not this the very reason of Invocation of Saints, that I mention not more of the like kind? 2. When you say, "*if he take a father into his covenant, "he takes the children in with him; If he reject the parents out of "covenant, the children are cast out with them.* If you mean this taking in, and casting out, in respect of election and reprobation, it is not true, neither if you mean it of the Covenant of grace, for that is congruous to election, and reprobation. Nor is it true in respect of outward Ordinances; the father may be baptized, heare the Word, and not the child; and on the contrary, the father may be deprived, and the child may enjoy them. Nor is it true in respect of Ecclesiasticall censures; the father may be excommunicated, and the sonne in the Church, and on the contrary. And about that which you say, there is no certainty in the Pædobaptists determination. [*Rutherford The due right of Presbyterie, p. 259.*] faith, *The children of Papists, and excommunicate Protestants, which are borne within our visible Church, are baptized, if their forefathers have been sound in the faith.* But others will deny it. But it is true as well of Pædobaptists, as of Anabaptists, that like waves of the Sea they beat one against another.

You tell us, "*That it was without question in the time of the Iews,* "Gen. 17. 9. *And when any of any other Nation, though a Canaanite,* "*an Hittite, acknowledged Abrahams God to be their God, they and* "*their children came into covenant together.*

That when Parents were circumcised, the Children were to be circumcised, is without question, Gods command is manifest; Whether this make any thing for baptizing Infants, is, to be considered in its place. But that which you say, "*It was in the time of the Iews, if God* "*did reject the parents out of the covenant, the children were cast out* "*with them*; is not true. Parents might be Idolaters, Apostates from Judaisme, draw up the fore-skin again, and yet the children were to be circumcised. But in all this there is no Argument.

Cotton, Way of the Churches of Christ in N.E. c. 4. §. 6. Infants cannot claim right unto baptisme, but in the right of one of their parents, or both. Where neither of the parents can claim right to the Lords supper, there their Infants cannot claim right to Baptisme. As therefore we do not receive an heathen to the fellowship of the supper, nor their seed to Baptism, so neither dare we receive an excommunicate person (who is to us an hea-

then) to the Lords supper, or his children to Baptisme. But after, c. 7 §. 2. Or where either of the parents have made such profession; Or it may be considered also, whether the children may not be baptized. where either the grand-father or grand-mother have made such profession; and are still living to undertake for the Christian education of the child. For it may be conceived where there is a stipulation of the Covenant on Gods part, and a stipulation on mans part, there may be an obligation of the Covenant on both parts. Gen. 17 7. Or if these faile, what hindereth, but that if the parents will delegue their infant to be educated in the house of any godly member of the Church, the child may be lawfully baptized in the right of its household governour, according to the proportion of the Law, Gen 17. 12, 13.

§. 6. Of the Texts, which are, *Act.* 2. 38, 39. *Luk* 19. 9.

THe first Text you dwell upon, is that, *Act.* 2. 38, 39. and thus you speak. "*And so it continues still, though the Anabaptists* "*boldly deny it*, Acts 2. 38, 39. *When* Peter *exhorted his hearers, who* "*were pricked in their hearts, to repent, and to be baptized for the re-* "*mission of sins, he useth an argument to perswade them, taken from* "*the benefit which should come to their posterity; For, the promise* "*(saith he) is to you and to your children, and to all that are afar off,* "*even as many as the Lord our God shall call: if once they obey the call* "*of God, as Abraham did, the promise was made to them and their* "*children. VVhether they who obey this call, were the present Jews to* "*whom he spake, or were afar off: Whether by afar off, you will mean* "*the Gentiles, who as yet worshipped afar off, or the Jews, or any who* "*were yet unborn, and so were afar off in time, or whether they dwelt* "*in the remotest parts of the world, and so were afar off in place; The* "*argument holds good to the end of the world, Repent and be baptized* "*for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the Holy Ghost, for the* "*promise is made to you and your children, they shall be made free of* "*Gods city according to Abrahams copy. I will be thy God, and the* "*God of thy seed.*

It is a very irksome thing to Readers, and especially to Answerers, when they that handle a controversie, give a text for their assertion, and make a paraphrase of it, but shew not how they conclude from it, by which meanes the enemy is more hardly found then vanquished. I wish, if ever yo write any more in this kind, you would distinctly expound, and then frame your arguments out of the text you produce: for the present I shall *devorare tædium*, swallow downe the tediousnes of this defect as well as I can. You do not distinctly tell us what that promise was, onely I gather it is, that which you after expresse, calling it "*Abrahams copy, I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed,* But then you do not distinctly tell us, under which part you comprehend the promise to them, whether under the first part, I will be thy God, or under the second, I will be the God of thy seed. It may seem you thus paralel'd them: I will be thy God, with, the promise is unto you; and, the God of thy seed, with that, the promise is to your children. But I must see better proofe then yet I have seen, afore I assent to this construction, I wilbe thy God, that is, of every believer: though the Author of infants baptizing proved lawfull by scriptures, page 4. saith, *It is plaine and manifest by the Gramaticall construction of this promise*; I professe that I neither know rule in Grammar, Logicke, or Divinity,

Divinity for that interpretation, and yet I thinke all the ſtrength of your proofe lies in this imagined paralelliſme. Nor doe you tell us of of what thing this promiſe was, which you parallel with *Abrahams* copy, I will be thy God, and the God of thy ſeed; whether it was a promiſe of ſaving graces, or outward priviledges; Onely that which you bring in of *Zaccheus* to interpret it, "*let him profeſſe the faith* 'of *Chriſt, and the covenant of ſalvation comes to his houſe*, ſeemes to import that you conceive the meaning thus; if you once obey the call of God as *Abraham* did, the promiſe of ſalvation is to you and your children: and ſith you anſwer the ſecond objection, which you call a ſhift, by rejecting the limiting of [*to you and your children*] with thoſe words [*as many as the Lord ſhall call*] the ſenſe muſt be this: *The promiſe of ſalvation is to you and your children, whether the Lord our God call them or not.* But this propoſition I know you will not ſtand to, though as you handle the matter, this is made the Apoſtles aſſertion. But it may be you mean otherwiſe, thus: *If you once obey the call of God, as Abraham did, the promiſe of outward church-priviledges, that is, to be members of the viſible Church, partakers of Baptiſm, &c. is to you and your children.* Now what an uncouth reaſon is by this made in the Apoſtles ſpeech, that if they did repent, and were baptized, *the promiſe ſhould be made good to them and to their children*, (I uſe your own words, expreſſing what you conceive the ſtrength of the argument lies in) *that you & they ſhalbe members of the viſible church, partakers of baptiſm, &c.* So that the Apoſtle is made to ſay thus: If you will repent and be baptized, the promiſe is to you and your children, that you & they ſhalbe baptized. What I conceive is the meaning, I will ſhew afterwards: in the mean time, becauſe (though on the bie) you alleage that Text, which Mr. *Tho. Goodwin* alſo at *Bow* in *Cheapſide* urged and inſiſted on for this purpoſe, I ſhall by the way examine what you ſay. You ſay, "*Let* Zaccheus *the Publican once receive Chriſt himſelf, be he a Gentile, as ſome think he was, be he a great* 'ſinner eſteemed as an heathen, *as we all know he was*; *let him profeſſe* 'the faith of Chriſt, *and the covenant of ſalvation comes to his, for* 'now he is made a ſon of *Abraham*, i.e. *Abrahams promiſe now reacheth him.* Upon which I note, 1. Though it be of like moment, whether he were a Gentile or no, yet I conceive it more likely he was a Jew, partly becauſe his name is made more like the hebrew, than the greek or latine; and partly becauſe if he had been a Gentile, Chriſt had plainly diſcovered the calling of the Gentiles, which he did not till afterward: & it would have cauſed in likelihood greater offence in them to hear a

Gentile

called a *son of Abraham*, who already *murmured that he was gone to be a guest to a man that was a sinner*. 2. You thus expound [*a son of Abraham*] that is, *Abrahams promise now reacheth him*. But *Beza* more truly, *Filium esse Abrahæ nihil aliud declarat quam gratis electum esse*, Rom. 9. 8. *Et vestigiis fidei Abrahæ insistere*, Rom. 4. 12. *Et opera Abrahæ facere*, Joh. 8. 39. *Ex quibus demum recte colligitur certa futuræ salutis expectatio*, Rom. 8. 29. 3. You only expresse [*this house*] by [*his*] as if you would have it conceived that salvation came only to his children by his believing, whereas Mr. *Tho. Goodwin* (if my memory deceive me not) comprehended the whole family under the term house, discoursing thereupon that a household-Church was *prima Ecclesia*, the first Church, which I marvailed to hear from him, as conceiving it to overthrow the way of Government they call the Church-way, which is mainly grounded on this, that the first Church (as *Parker* held) is a single congregation out of many families, and is *prima sedes potestatis Ecclesiastica*, the first seat of Ecclesiasticall power. But I know no reason why, when it is said, *Salvation is come to this house*, it should be stretched any further then *Zacheus* his person, in that salvation was come to him, salvation was come to his house, and the whole Narration favours this Exposition, and *Beza* saith that *Theophylact*, and some others understand by house *Zacheus* himselfe. I omit the conceit of *Erasmus*, and *Camerarius*, as if αὗτος *this*, did refer to οἶκος *house*, for I thinke with *Beza*, it is absurd to say, *This house is a son of* Abraham. 4. Although it be true, that καθότι is often a Causall particle, yet it is true, that it is sometimes a restrictive particle, as Acts 2. 45. and Acts 4. 35. and therefore may be rendred by *quatenus* as, or *in quantum* in as much, or *secundum quod*, according to what, as well as by *eo quod quoniam*, or *quandoquidem*, because, or forasmuch. 5. In your paraphrase, you put instead of salvation, *The Covenant of salvation*, which is not right, what ever Author you may follow herein. Now let it be considered what an erroneous inference is made, by expounding it of all the posterity or family, and making the particle Causall, as if his believing alone did bring salvation to his house or posterity; from whence this may be gathered, a mans whole house or posterity may be saved barely by his believing, and you will see a necessity to make καθότι a restrictive particle, and to expound this house of *Zacheus*, his family only, in reference to his person. And so what you take in by the way for the credit of your conclusion, from *Luke* 19. 9. is answered

swered by shewing the faultinesse of your paraphrase.

But you returne to the Text, Acts 2.38 39. "You say, *neither can* "*the evidence of the place be eluded, by saying the promise here meant is* "*of the extraordinary gifts of the holy Ghost, to speak with tongues &c.* "*for we all know, that all who then beleeved and were baptized, did not* "*receive those extraordinary gifts of the holy Ghost; and beside, this ar-* "*gument remained still in force, to be used to the end of the world, who* "*ever beleeves and is baptized, shall receive remission of sins, and the* "*gift of the holy Ghost, which was not true, if by the holy Ghost was* "*meant onely those extraordinary gifts.*

Though I doe not so expound the words, [*the promise is to you and your children*] of the extraordinary gifts of the holy Ghost, yet the words next before, and that which is before, *verse* 33. 17, 18 of the same chapter might very well induce men to conceive that this is the promise of which *Peter* meant, *verse* 39. not doe I conceive your reasons sufficient to overthrow it: For what though "*all who then,* "*beleeved and were baptized, did not receive those extraordinary gifts* "*of the holy Ghost,* yet *Peter* might assure them that it should be so for the future, *to them, their children, and all that are afarre off, as many as the Lord should call:* though I doe not say, the thing was true in this sense; I onely say it might be so true, notwithstanding your argument. And whereas you say "*this argument remaines still in force* "*to be used to the end of the world, Who ever beleeves and is baptized,* "*shall receive remission of sinnes, and the gift of the holy Ghost.* Neither doth this follow from the exposition of the words, *verse* 39. by the words, *verse* 38. of receiving the gift of the holy Ghost: For there is nothing in the text to prove that this argument still remaines in force as you speake, sith it might be onely a particular benefit to them on their repenting, and baptisme, for ought you can inferre from the text.

You go on. "*Nor secondly, can it be avoided by that shift of others* "*who interpret it thus, to you and your children, as many of them as the* "*Lord shall call, that is (say they) whether your selves or your chil-* "*dren, or any other whom the Lord shall call, if they repent and be bap-* "*tized, they shall receive the gift of the holy Ghost.* If you put in stead of, [*they shall receive the gift of the holy Ghost,*] these words [*the promise is to you and them,*] it is no shift, but the genuine and necessarie explication of the text. For let the promise be what ever you can make it, you must put in that limitation if you will have it true.

If the promise be of saving graces, if of Christ sent, if of the outward ordinances of baptisme, &c. If of the holy Ghost in extraordinarie gifts; it is none of these wayes true without that limitation. For neither God promised saving graces, nor outward ordinances, nor extraordinarie gifts, nor sent Christ to them, their children, or all that are afar off without calling them and every of them. But you tell us, it is plaine, "*the strength of the argument lies in this, That if they did repent, and were baptized, the promise should be made good to them and to their children: and what comfortable argument can this be taken from respect to their children, if the Apostle must be interpreted as these men would have him, viz. you and your children have hitherto been an holy seed, but now, if you beleeve in Christ your selves, your children shall be in no better condition then the rest of the Pagan world, strangers from the Covenant of God; but if afterward any of them, or any of the heathen, shall for their parts beleeve and be baptized, their particular persons shall be taken into covenant, but their children still left out; had this thinke you been a comfortable argument to perswade them to come in, in relation to the good of their children after them.*"

You suppose here, that the Apostle used this argument onely in relation to the good of their children, whereas the maine matter was concerning themselves to erect them, who being told that they had *crucified Jesus who was both Lord and Christ*, verse 36. and had said, Matth. 27. 25. *His blood be upon us and our children*, *were pricked in their hearts*, and said to *Peter* and the rest of the Apostles, *Men and brethren what shall we do?* and was it not a comfortable argument for men in that case to be told, that notwithstanding all this, the promise of Christ, and remission of sinnes by him, was yet to them and their children, on whom they had wished Christs blood to be, and to all the Jewes that dwelt afarre off in the dispersion, as many as the Lord should call: and a great incitement to repent and be baptized in the Name of the Lord Jesus for the remission of sinnes? However you conceive now, sure if your soule had been in their soules stead, you would have conceived it a very comfortable speech in this sense, that I now give. As for that witlesse descant you put on your adversaries, I know not whether it be their meaning or not, sure I am no such thing follows on the applying the restriction in the end of the verse, *to them, their children, and all that are afarre off.* And that which you would burden your adversaries tenent with, as if they

put

put beleivers infants out of the covenant, into the condition of Pagans children, it is a coccysme answeted before, and therefore I may well let it passe in this place.

" You adde, *The plaine strength of the argument is, God hath now re-*
" *membred his Covenant to* Abraham *in sending that blessed seed, in*
" *whom he promised to be the God of him and his seed: doe not you by*
" *your unbeliefe deprive your selves and your posteritie of so excellent*
" *a gift.*

In this passage I thinke you hit the marke, it is the very interpretation I gave in the reasons of my doubts before mentioned, in answering the argument from this text: onely the alleadging the promise, *Gen.* 17.7. and that expression, *do not you by your unbeliefe deprive your posteritie of so excellent a gift*; have a little relish of your interpretation of the promise concerning the naturall seed of beleevers: But letting that passe, in the maine you expound it rightly. " *The pro-*
" *mise is to you and your children; that is, God hath now remembred*
" *his Covenant to* Abraham *in sending that blessed seed, in whom hee*
" *promised to be the God of* Abraham *and his seed*, and the sense is plaine. The promise which is made to *Abraham* is now fulfilled in sending Christ to you and your children, and to all that are afarre off, as many as the Lord our God shall call, that they might bee turned from their iniquity, and baptized in his name for the remission of their sinnes; And this agrees with the Apostles exhortation to the same purpose, Acts 3. 25. 26. *Ye are the children of the Prophets and of the*
" *covenant which God made with our fathers, saying unto* Abraham,
" *and in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed, unto you*
" *first God having raised up his Sonne Jesus, sent him to blesse you in*
" *turning away every one of you from his iniquities.* And Acts 13. 32,
" 33. *And we declare unto you glad tidings, how that the promise*
" *which was made unto the fathers God hath fulfilled the same unto us*
their children, in that he hath raised up Jesus againe.

Annot. on the Bible, edit. 1645. on Acts 2. 36. *The promise is unto you*] *Christ is promised both to Iewes and Gentiles: but the Iewes had the first place.*

You adde. " *And except in relation to the covenant, there was no*
" *occasion to name their children; it had been sufficient to have said, a*
" *promise is made to as many as the Lord shall call.* Though I deny not their children are mentioned in relation to the covenant in the sense I have given, or rather in allusion to the forme of expressions in the covenant, and predictions of the Prophets: yet there was other occasion, to wit, their imprecation, *Matth.* 27.25. and especially because Christ was, as it is *Acts* 3. 26. first sent to the Jews and their chil-

children, and to be offered firſt to them, as it is *Acts* 13. 46. But it was not to intimate that which you would gather, *that the promiſe is ſuch to them, if they did beleeve that their children, even their infants upon their fathers faith, whether the children were called or not, were taken into the covenant, either of ſaving graces, or viſible church-memberſhip*; which you ſhould have proved, but never will prove out of this Scripture. But taking your Hypotheſis, that theſe to whom *Peter* ſpeakes were within the covenant made to *Abraham*, and circumciſed rightly, and yet the Apoſtle requires theſe to repent, afore they are to be baptized; the Antipædobaptiſts have hence a good argument againſt baptizing infants, becauſe *Peter* required of ſuch as were in the covenant, repentance afore Baptiſm. I paſſe on to the next proof you bring for your Concluſion.

§. 7. Of the text. *Rom.* 11. 16.

"*You ſay, as plain it is out of the* 11. *Rom.* 16, *&c. where the apoſtles* "*ſcope is to ſhew, that we Gentiles have now the ſame graffing into* "*the true olive which the Jews formerly had; and our preſent graffing* "*in, is anſwerable to their preſent caſting out, & their taking in in the* "*latter end of the world, ſhall be the ſame graffing in (though more glo-* "*rioufly) as ours is now. Now all know that whē they were taken in, they* "*and their children were taken in; when they were broken off, they and* "*their children were broken off; When they ſhall be taken in, in the lat-* "*ter end of the world, they and their children ſhall be taken in; and that* "*becauſe the root is holy, that is, Gods covenant with* Abraham, Iſaac, "and Jacob, *extends yet unto them, when their unbelief ſhall be taken* "*away. The root being like Nebuchadnezars tree, the tree hewen down;* "*and the root bound with a band of iron, until ſeven times were paſſed* "*over it, and then the bands ſhould be broken, & the root ſhould ſpring,* "*and the tree ſhould grow again: So their preſent nation like this tree is* "*cut down, and this holy root the covenant made with their forefathers* "*is ſuſpended, bound with an iron bar of unbelief, blindneſſe being come* "*upon them untill the fulnes of the Gentiles were come in, and then all* "*Iſrael ſhall be ſaved. And mark, that in all this diſcourſe, the holines* "*of the branches there ſpoken of, is not meant of a perſonall inherent ho-* "*lines, but a derivative holines, a holines derived to them frō their an-* "*ceſtors, the firſt fruit is holy, the lump holy, the root holy, the branches* "*holy, that is, the fathers holy, accepted in covenant with God; the chil-* "*dren beloved for their fathers ſake, and when the vail of unbelief ſhall* "*be taken away, the children and their poſterity ſhal be taken in again,* "*becauſe beloved for their fathers ſakes. Now then if our graffing in be* "*anſwerable to theirs, in all, or any of theſe three particulars, We and* "*our children are graffed in together.* Your

Your argument needs a ſwimmer of *Delos* to bring it out of the eep, I will dive as deep as I can to fetch it up; the thing, it ſeems, you vould prove, is, that we and our children are graffed in together; but he words are Metaphoricall, and therefore obſcure, they may be true ı a ſenſe, and yet not for your purpoſe. The inſition you ſpeak of may e either into the viſible, or invſible church; the graffing in, may be ei-her by faith, or by profeſſion of faith, or by ſome outward ordinance. Children may be either grown men or infants, the graffing in may be ither certain, or probable; certain, either by reaſon of election, cove-ıant of grace made by them, or naturall birth, being children of be-ievers; probable, as being likely, either becauſe frequently, or for the he moſt part it happens ſo, though not neceſſary & ſo not certain. The hing that is to be proved is, that all the infants of every believer are in he covenant of free grace in Chriſt, & by vertue thereof to be bapti-ed into the communion of the viſible church: now it may be granted hat infants of believers are frequently, or for the moſt part under the lection & covenant of grace (which whether it be ſo or not, no meere nan can tel) and ſo in the viſible church, & yet it not follow that every nfant of a believer, in aſmuch as he is the child of a believer, is under he covenant of grace, & therefore by baptiſme is to be admitted into he viſible church; now let it be never ſo probable, that God continues his election in the poſterity of believers & accordingly hath promiſed o be their God in his covenant of grace, yet if this be the rule of bap-izing children of beleivers, no other infants are to be baptized, but ſuch as are thus: the practiſe muſt agree with the rule; & ſo not all in-fants of believers are to be baptized, but the elect in the covenant of grace. If it be ſaid; but we are to judge all to be elected, & in the cove-nant of grace, till the contrary appeares. I anſwer, that we are not to judge all to be elected, or in the covenant of grace; becauſe we have Gods declaration of his mind to the contrary, *Rom.* 9.6,7,8. and all ex-perience proves the contrary to be true; nor is the adminiſtration of an outward ordinãce inſtituted by God, according to ſuch a rule as is not poſſible to be known, but according to that which is manifeſt to the miniſters of it; & therefore ſith God conceals his purpoſe of election, and the covenant of grace, which is congruous to it in reſpect of the perſons elected; it is certain God would not have this the rule accord-ing to which outward ordinances are to be adminiſtred, becauſe ſuch perſons are in the election and covenant of grace & not others. "*You* "*ſay, our graffing in is anſwerable to the Jews, and their infants were* "*graffed in by circũciſion, therefore ours are to be graffed in by baptiſm.*

But in good sadnesse, doe you thinke the Apostle here meanes by graffing in, baptizing, or circumcision, or inition by an outward ordinance: if that were the meaning, then breaking off must be meant of uncircumcising or unbaptizing. The whole context speaks of election of some, and rejection of others, of the breaking off by unbeliefe, and the standing by faith, and your selfe seeme to understand the phrase so, when you say, pag. 43. *to cut miserable man off from the wilde olive, and graffe him into the true olive.* The ingrafting, to me, is meant of the invisible church by election and faith; which invisible church was first amongst the Jews, and therefore called the olive, out of *Abraham* the root, who is therefore said to beare them. And because *Abraham* had a double capacitie, one of a naturall father, and anotherof the father of the faithfull, in respect of the former capacitie, some are called *branches according to nature*, others, *wilde olives by nature*, yet *graffed in by faith*; and when it is said that *some of the naturall branches were broken off*, the meaning is not that some of the branches in the invisible church may be broken off: but as when our Saviour Christ saith, using the same similitude, *Joh.* 15. 2. *Every branch in me not bearing fruit, he taketh away*; The meaning is not, that any branch truely in him could be fruitlesse, or taken away; but he calleth that a branch in him which was only so in appearance. So the Apostle speaking of branches broken off, meanes it not of such as were truely so, but in appearance: For *similitudes doe not runne with four feet*; but vary in some things. Now if this be the meaning of your words, that the inition of the Gentiles is the same with the Jewes, and the inition is meant of ingraffing by faith into the invisible church; it onely proves this, that now beleevers of Gentiles are by faith in the church of the elect, as the Jewes: but neither the beleeving Jewes Infants were in the covenant of grace, because their children; nor are our children. But let us consider the three particulars you speake of, that we may examine whether there be any shew of an argument for your purpose in this text. You say, "*as plaine it is out of the eleventh of* "*Rom.* 16. *&c. Where the Apostles scope is, to shew, that we Gentiles* "*have now the same graffing into the true olive which the Jews formerly had, and our present graffing in, is answerable to their present casting out; and their taking in, in the latter end of the World, shal be the* "*same graffing in (though more gloriously) as ours is now.*

The Apostles scope in the whole chapter is plaine to answer that question, *v.* 1. *Hath God cast away his people?* which he doth, 1. by shewing

shewing for the present in himselfe, and others, perhaps unknowne, *That God had then a remnant according to the election of grace.* 2. For the future from ver. 11. to the end, that he intends a *calling of all Israel when the fulnesse of the Gentiles shall come in*, and ver. 16. is one argument to prove it. It is not the scope of the Apostle, as you say, *To shew that the Gentiles have now the same graffing into the true Olive, which the Jews formerly had*; but to prove that the Jews, notwithstanding their present defraction, shall be graffed into their owne Olive. But for the thing it selfe. You say, "*That the Gentiles have* "*now the same graffing into the true Olive which the Jews formerly* "*had.* But you must remember your own distinction, pag. 10. of the substance of the Covenant, and the administration of it: It is certain, that in respect of the substance of the Covenant, we have the same graffing into the Olive, the Church of the faithfull, of which *Abraham* is the root, that the Jews had. *We by faith are partakers of the root and fatnesse of the Olive tree.* ver. 17. or in plainer termes, as the Apostle elegantly, *Ephes.* 3:6 that the Gentiles should be συγκληρονόμα καὶ σύσσωμα καὶ συμμέτοχα, *Fellow-heirs, and of the same body, and partakers of his promise in Christ through the Gospel.* In respect of which all believing Gentiles are *Abrahams seed, the Israel of God, one in Christ Jesus.* But if you mean it of the outward administration of this ingrafting by Circumcision, Baptisme, &c. nothing is more false. For indeed the outward administration is utterly taken away, as separating the Jews from the Gentiles, of very purpose, that the enmity betwixt Jews and Gentiles may be removed, and they made one in Christ by his death *Eph.* 2. 14, 15, 16. and if you mean this, when you say, we have the same graffing in with the Jews (which your whole arguing tends to, and your expression in those words [*for these outward dispensations*] import you mean it) you evacuate the blood of Christ in this particular. You say, "*Our present graffing in, is an-* "*swerable to their present casting out.* It is true, our present graffing in is answerable to their (or rather for their) casting out; that is, God would supply in his Olive tree the Church, the casting away of the Jews, by the calling of the Gentiles, so much the Apostle saith, v. 17. *Thou being a wilde Olive,* ἐνεκεντρίσθης ἐν αὐτοῖς, that is, *in ramorum defectorum locum*, into the place of the branches broken off as rightly *Beza*; if you mean it in this sense, I grant it. You adde, "*And* "*their taking in (though more gloriously) as ours is now.* It is true, their taking in will be by faith, as ours is now; concerning other particulars,

particulars, as I doubt not but it will be *more gloriouſly*, as you ſay, ſ
for the manner, I muſt confeſſe I am at a ſtand. I look upon it as
myſtery, as the Apoſtle cals it, *Rom.* 11.25. You go on. "*Now all kno*
"*that when they were taken in, they and their children were taken i*
"*when they were broken off, they and their children were broken of*
"*when they ſhall be taken in in the latter end of the world, they a*
"*their children ſhall be taken in.* I grant it, they were taken in, a
broken off together, in reſpect of Gods election and reprobation, a
when they ſhall be taken in, in the latter end of the world, they a
their children ſhall be taken in. Yea, I thinke, that as at the callin
of the Gentiles there was a fuller taking in of the children of th
Gentiles, then ever was of the children of the Jewes afore Chriſt
comming, according to that *Heb.* 8.11. So at the calling of the Jew
there ſhall be a more full taking in of the children of the Jews, the
is now of the Gentiles, according to that, *Rom.* 11. 26. and ſo *all I*
rael ſhall be ſaved. But all this proves not, that God would hav
either all Infants of believers counted his as elect perſons, or in th
Covenant of grace in Chriſt, or in the face of the viſible Church ad
mitted to baptiſme: which was to be proved by you.

You go on. "*And that becauſe the root is holy, that is, Gods Co*
"*venant with* Abraham, Iſaac, *and* Jacob *extends yet unto them*
"*when their unbeliefe ſhall be taken away; and then after an illuſtra*
"*tion from* Nebuchadnezzars *dreame,* Dan. 4 14, 15. *you ſay of th*
"*Jews, their preſent Nation like this tree is cut down, and this hol*
"*root, the Covenant made with their forefathers is ſuſpended, boun*
"*with an Iron barre of unbeliefe, blindneſſe being come upon them til*
"*the fulneſſe of the Gentiles be come in, and then all Iſrael ſhall be ſa*
"*ved.* In this paſſage you ſomewhat alter the Apoſtles reſemblance
who doth not make the Jewiſh Nation to anſwer the tree, but th
branches, nor doth he ſay the tree is cut down, but the branches bro
ken off; and here you make the *Covenant the root*, but a little afte
your words import, when you ſay, *a holineſſe derived from their an*
ceſtors, &c. that by the root you mean their Anceſtors. And yo
ſay, *The Covenant made with their forefathers is ſuſpended*, which in
ſome ſenſe may be true, that is thus, the effects of Gods love to Iſrae
are for the preſent ſuſpended from thoſe generations, and ſo in our ap
prehenſion the Covenant is ſuſpended; but in exact ſpeech it cannot
be true, ſith Gods Covenant according to his intention and meaning
cannot be ſuſpended or ſtayed, but doth alwayes take effect irreſiſti-

bly

bly. In that wherein you alter the resemblance of the Apostle, by putting in *the cutting down of the tree*, instead *of breaking off the branches*, you much pervert the Apostles meaning; who makes the tree, that is, the Church of believers, still standing, and some branches broken off, and others graffed in. And for that of the root, it is true, it is variously conceived by Interpreters, some understanding with you the Covenant, some Christ, some *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob*, and some *Abraham* only, which last I conceive to be genuine, for the expressions of some branches κατὰ φύσιν, according to nature, and others παρὰ φύσιν besides nature: *Some naturall, some ingraffed, our not bearing the root, but the root bearing us*, are plain evidences to me, that by the root, *Abraham* is meant; Nor know I how to make the resemblance right, but by this Exposition. Now to say, *the root, that is, Abraham, is bound with an Iron band of unbeliefe*, cannot have any handsome construction. But you tell us: *And marke "that in all this discourse, the holinesse of the branches there spoken of, "is not meant of a personall inherent holinesse.* Then Master *Thomas Goodwin* is answered, who in urging 1 *Cor.*7.14. for Pædobaptisme, saith, *in the New Testament, there is no other holinesse spoken of, but personall or reall by regeneration*, about the which he challenged all the world to shew the contrary: whereas here is according to you, a holinesse which is not *personall*, or as Mr. *Blake* speakes, *qualitative, and inherent*. But to go on. You say, "*But a derivative holinesse, a "holinesse derived to them from their Ancestors, the first fruit is ho- "ly, the lump holy, the root holy, the branches holy; that is, the Fa- "thers holy, accepted in Covenant with God, the children beloved for "their Fathers sake; and when the vail of unbeliefe shall be taken a- "way, the children & their posterity shall be taken in again, because be- "loved for their fathers sake: Now then, if our graffing in be answer- "able to theirs in any, or all of these three particulars, we and our chil- "dren are graffed in together.* Object. *But here is no mention of our "Infants graffing in.* Answ. *We must not teach the Lord to speake, "but with reverence search out his meaning; there is no mention made "of the casting out of the Jewish Infants, neither here, nor elsewhere, "when he speakes of taking away the Kingdome of God from them, and "giving it to the Gentiles, who would bring forth fruit; no mention of "the Infants of the one, or of the other, but the one and the other, for "these outward dispensations are comprehended in their parents, as the "branches in the root, the infants of the godly in their parents according "to*

So also the new Annot. on *Rom.*11.16

" *to the tenor of his mercy, the infants of the wicked in their parents*
" *according to the tenor of his justice.*

There are sundry things in this passage you would have to be marked, that deserve indeed to be marked, but with an Obeliske, not with an Asteriske, as 1. That you oppose personall inherent holinesse to derivative, as inconsistent. The truth is, the holinesse the Apostle speaks of, is, first in respect of Gods Election, holinesse personall and inherent, in Gods intention, *He hath chosen us that we should be holy* Ephes. 1 4. Secondly, it is also holinesse derivative, or descending, no from any Ancestors, but from *Abraham*, not barely, as a naturall father, but as a spirituall father, or *Father of the faithfull*, and so derived from the Covenant of grace, which passed in his name to him and his seed. And lastly, it shall be inherent actually, being communicated by the Spirit of God, when they shall be actually called. But this is such a kinde of holinesse, as is more then you mean, to wit, no only an adherent, or relative holinesse, which they have by enjoying outward Ordinances, but also inherent, by faith, whereby they are holy, as the root, that is, *Abraham* the father of the faithfull.

2. Whereas you make it the case of any believers to be a holy root to their posterity, especially in the following words, when you say " *The infants both of the Jews, and Gentiles for these outward dispen*
" *sations, are comprehended in their parents, as the branch in the*
" *root, the infants of the godly in their parents, according to the tenor*
" *of his mercy, the infants of the wicked in their parents, according to*
" *the tenor of his justice:* Master *Blake* pag. 8. more plainly, *The*
" *branches of Ancestors are roots of posterity, being made a holy branch*
" *in reference to their issue, they now become a holy root.* This is not true, for in the Apostles resemblance, *Abraham* only is a holy root or at most, *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Iacob*, in whose names the Covenant runs. No other man, though a believer, is *the father of the faithfull*, but *Abraham:* And the body of believers is compared to the Olive, and each believer to a branch, *that partakes of the root and fatnesse of the Olive tree*, not in outward dispensations only, as you speak, but also in saving graces, which is mainly here intended. I remember Master *Thomas Goodwin*, who hath handled this matter of Paedobaptisme, by spinning out similitudes and conjectures (fit indeed for the common people, that are more taken with resemblances then Syllogismes) rather then with close arguments: indeavoured to infer a kinde of promise of deriving holinesse from believers to their posterity

rity, cut of the similitude of an Olive, and its branches, compared with *Psal.* 128 3. &c. but it is dangerous to strain similitudes beyond that likeneſſe the Holy Ghoſt makes. It is a tedious thing to Auditors that look for arguments, to be deluded with similitudes and conjectures.

3. Whereas you alluding to the words of the Apoſtle, *v.*28. that the Jews were *beloved for their fathers ſake*, carry it, as if this were true of any believing parents; the Apoſtle meanes it of thoſe fathers only, in whoſe names the Covenant was made, eſpecially *Abraham* called *the friend of God*, Jam. 2. 23. and *the father of the faithfull*, Rom. 4 11. and in reference to the promiſes made to them, they are beloved, and therefore it is added, ver. 29. *For the gifts and calling of God are without repentance.*

Laſtly, you ſay *That the infants of the wicked for theſe outward diſ-*
"*penſations, are comprehended in their parents, according to the tenor*
"*of Gods juſtice.* I intreat you to conſider, whether this ſpeech do not ſymbolize with the tenet of *Arminius* in his *Antiperkins* on the fourth Crimination, and in the end of his Treatiſe, where he maketh the cauſe, why the poſterity of ſome people have not the Goſpel, to be their forefathers fault in refuſing it. Againſt which you may ſee what Doctor *Twiſſe* oppoſeth in both places, and *Moulin* in his Anatomy of Arminianiſme, *cap.*9. And thus it may appeare, that you have very much darkened this illuſtrious Scripture, by applying that holineſſe and inſition to outward diſpenſations only in the viſible Church, which is meant of ſaving graces into the inviſible by faith, and made every believer a like root to his poſterity, with *Abraham* to his ſeed.

Arminius l. 1. Antiperk p. 3. Sect. 6. *Infantes in parentibus, avis, abavis atavis, tritavis Evangelii gratiam repudiarunt, quo actu meruerunt ut a Deo deſererentur velim enim mihi, &c.*

Perpetua enim eſt fœderis Dei ratio quod filii in parentibus comprehendantur & cenſeantur. Cui opponit *Twiſſus* ibidem *Nec uſquam in ſacris literis ſignificatur Deum ejuſmodi fœdus cum homine larſo pepigiſſe ut ſi crederet, adipiſceretur gratiam & ſibi & poſteris; contra ſi non crederet & ſibi & poſteris ſuis gratiam amitteret; ejuſmodi fœdus ſub conditione obedientiæ cum Adamo initum fuiſſe omnes Theologi agnoſcunt.*

§. 8. Of the Text 1 Cor. 7. 14.

I Am now come to your principall hold, you ſay. "*And yet*
"*plainer (if plainer may be) is the ſpeech of the Apoſtle in*
"1. Cor. 7 14. *The unbelieving husband is ſanctified by the wife, and*
"*the unbelieving wife is ſanctified by the husband, elſe were your chil-*
"*dren uncleane. but now they are holy.*

By the way. Becauſe you acknowledge in the Margin page 24. *that* ὁ *ſignifies* to, *as well as* in, *and you conceive it may be here read* [*in*] *or*

or [*to*] *as well as* [*by*] and though our translators following the vulgar read [*by*] yet *Beza* dislikes that reading; it might have done well in the citing of this text by you, to have given some hint of that varietie. But to follow you. You say, "*the plain scope and meaning there-*
"*of is this. The believing Corinthians amongst other cases of Consci-*
"*ence, which they had sent to the Apostle for his resolution of, had writ-*
"*ten this for one, Whether it were lawfull for them who were convert-*
"*ed, still to retaine their Infidell wives or husbands.* You doe rightly here expresse the scope of the Apostle, but you make another scope, page 25. when you say; "*We must attend the Apostles scope, which is*
"*to shew, that the children would be unholy, if the faith or believership*
"*of one of the parents could not remove the barre, which lies in the other*
"*being an unbeliever, against the producing a holy seed*; which I shall shew in its place, not to be the scope of the place; but only this which you first give. You then say, "*their doubt seemes to arise from the*
"*Law of God, which was in force to the Nation of the Jews, God had*
"*not only forbidden such marriages to his people; but in* Ezra's *time*
"*they put away, not onely their wives: but all the children that were*
"*borne of them, as not belonging to the Common-wealth of Israel: and*
"*it was done according to the Law, and that Law was not a particu-*
"*lar Edict which they did agree upon but according to the standing*
"*Law of* Moses, *which that word there used signifieth, and in* Nehemi-
"ahs *time the children who were born of such marriages were account-*
"*ed a mungrell kinde, whom* Nehemiah *cursed: Now hereupon these*
"*Corinthians doubted whether their children as well as their wives,*
"*were not to be accounted unclean: and so to be put away according to*
"*those examples.* You declared rightly the scope before: but the doubt is not rightly put by you. The Corinthians had no doubt whether their children were unclean, and to be put away; for the Apostle, argues from the uncleanesse of their children, as a thing that appeared absurd to them, they *tooke it as a common received principle, that their children were holy*, as rightly Master *Thomas Goodwin* at Bow-church. And for the occasion of the doubt, though I deny not, but the Corinthians might know that fact of *Ezra* 9. and 10. yet that the reading of it was the cause of their doubt I see no evidence or likelihood, though Master *Blake* pag. 12. takes it as granted, joyning with the relations, *Ezra* 9. and 10. that resolution, *Hag.* 2. 12. 13. as the occasion of the doubt, and Mr. *Thomas Goodwin* seemed confident of it that it could be no other upon a supposed agreement of matter and phrase.

But

ut for matter I see very little agreement, the cases being far different f two persons not under the Law marrying in unbelief, and of two ersons under the Law, the one a Iew by profession, the other a stran-er. And for phrases, except the word [*holy*] I observe no other hrase used in *Ezra* which is used by the Apostle; not the phrase of *nbelieving husband or wife, or sanctified to, in, or by the wife or hus-and*, nor the phrase of *unclean children*, and for the tearm [*holy*] he Apostle doth not use the phrase [*holy seed*] as *Ezra* doth. In ny apprehension it is farre more likely that the doubt arose from the Epistle he wrote before to them mentioned, 1 *Cor.* 5. 9. μὴ συναναμίγνυσθαι πόρνοις ἢ εἰδωλολάτραις, &c. 10. *Not to keep company with Fornicators or Idolaters*, which might occasion the question, whether they were then to continue with their unbelieving Yokefellows?

Tertul. lib. 2. ad uxorem. cap. 3. *Fideles Gentilium matrimonia subeuntes supponi reos esse constat & arcendos ab omni communicatione fraternitatis ex literis Apostoli dicentis cum ejusmodi nec cibum sumendum.*

"But let us examine the Apostles resolution, you say. *To which* "*the Apostle answers, no, they were not to be put away, upon what spe-*"*ciall reason soever, that law was in force to the Iews, believing* "*Christians were not in that condition. The unbelieving wife was* "*sanctified in the believing husband*, quoad hoc, *so far as to bring forth* "*a holy seed. Were it with them, as when both of them were unbeli-*"*evers, so that neither of them had a prerogative to intitle their chil-*"*dren to the covenant of grace, thier children would be an unclean* "*progeny: Or were the children to be reckoned in the condition of the* "*worser parent, so that the unbeliever could contribute more to Pa-*"*ganisme, than the believer to Christianity, it were so likewise. But* "*the case is otherwise; the believing husband hath by Gods ordinance* "*a sanctified use of his unbelieving wife; so as by Gods speciall pro-*"*mise made to believers and their seed, they were invested in, and to the* "*most spirituall end of marriage, the continuance of a holy seed, where-*"*in the Church is to be propagated to the worlds end. And the case is* "*here in relation to posterity, for spirituall priviledges, as in other* "*marriages for civill priviledges: as, suppose a Prince or Noble man* "*marry with a woman of base and mean birth, though in generall it be* "*true, that the children of those that be base, are born base, as well as* "*the children of Nobles are born noble, yet here the issue hath honour* "*from the father, and it is not accounted base by the baseness of the* "*mother. This I take to be the plain meaning of the Apostles answer.*

And must your Readers, thinke you, take it on your word, without shewing that the tearms are so used elsewhere, or connexion of the words, or the analysis of the text lead you to it? But it is necessary

that I discusse this matter more fully, then by returning a bare denyall, to a bare affirmation. Concerning the answer verse 13. there is no difference, all the difference is concerning the reason of the resolution delivered *ver.* 14. and the meaning of it. There are these terms doubtfull. 1. What is meant by ἐν τῇ γυναικὶ, *in the Wife*; and ἐν τῷ ἀνδρὶ *in the husband*. 2. What is meant by ἡγίασται *is sanctified*. 3. What is meant by ἀκάθαρτα *unclean*. 4. What by ἅγια *holy*. It is agreed, that ἐν may be read, *in*, *to*, or *by*. It is agreed, that to be *sanctified*, hath many senses, and that the sense wherein sanctification is taken for renovation of mind, is not here meant, for so an unbeliever is not sanctified, and the speech is *in sensu compositio*, in a compound sense to be understood: An unbeliever, though an unbeliever, is sanctified. Nor is it true of any kind of Ceremoniall sanctification, or sanctification for enjoying religious ordinances; for such could not agree to an unbeliever. Therefore there remain only two senses, the one of an *instrumentall sanctification*, as Mr. *Goodwin* cals it, *for the begetting a holy seed*; The other of *matrimoniall sanctification*, whereby *the one is enjoyed as a chaste yoke-fellow by another, Without fornication.* The former of these, your words intimate, you imbrace, when you say, the "*unbelieving wife was sanctified in the believing husband*, quoad hoc, "*so far as to bring forth a holy seed.* But against this are these reasons, 1. This could not have resolved the doubt in the case of those, who by age could not be sanctified to this end, or by reason of accidentall inability for generation, they might depart each from other, notwithstanding this reason: whereas the Apostles resolution is, of all husbands and wives; *The unbelieving husband is sanctified*, that is, every unbelieving husband is sanctified. If meant of Instrumentall sanctification, it were true only of those that are apt for generation, yea that do actually generate: whereas the Apostles determination is concerning any husband or wife that were of different religion. 2. If the Apostle, by being sanctified, meant instrumentally sanctified to beget a holy seed, then the reason had been thus: *You may live together, for you may beget a holy seed.* And so their consciences should have been resolved of their present lawfull living together, from a future event, which was uncertain; It had been taken from a thing contingent, that might be, or not be: whereas the resolution is, by a reason taken from a thing certain, a thing present, or past; and therefore he useth the preterperfect tense, ἡγίασται *hath been sanctified*; yea, in probability he speaks of a sanctification, even when both were unbelievers:

elievers: for he saith, ἡγίασται twice in the preterperfect tense, and e mentions the unbelieving, distinctly; but the believer, without the xpression of his, or her faith, under the title of husband, or wife; and ith, your children, *indiscriminatim*, without difference, as well hose you had before one of you was a believer, as since. However, it manifest the Apostles reason is taken from a thing not contingent, ut certain, not future, but present or past, and therefore not from in-trumentall sanctification for the begetting of a holy seed, which was future thing, and that contingent.

This was so manifest to *Chamier*, that, *tom.* 4. *Panstrat. Cathol. ib.* 5. *c.* 10. §. 46. he proves, that sanctification here cannot be under-ood of sanctification by conversion of the unbeliever through the iligence of the wife, from this reason: *Primum quia incerta ratio st, etsi enim nonnunquam ita factum, tamen plerumque etiam aliter,* which I may apply to your instrumentall sanctification, in the same words. And after, *In præteritum dixit; sanctificatus est non autem anctificabitur, rem jam constitutam, & peractam non autem in futu-rum rem incertam, aut optandam, aut expectandam.* 3. When any person is said to be instrumentally sanctified for a purpose, this san-ctification is ascribed to God, as *Jer.* 1. 5. *Isa.* 13. 3. as selecting some from others to such an use, but here the sanctification is common to all unbelieving husbands in respect of their wives, and comes from that common relation, not speciall designation. 4. According to this Exposition, the words following could not be true, *Else were your children uncleane, but now are they holy:* For in this form of reason-ing, this Proposition is included. *Their children could not be holy without that sanctification*, but that had been false, understanding it of *instrumentall sanctification*; and of *fœderall*, or of *reall inherent personall* holinesse. For their children might be in Covenant, and be regenerated, though their parents by reason of their unbeliefe had been neither of them sanctified to the other, for the begetting of a holy seed. The children of Infidel-parents may be in the Covenant of grace, and be sanctified. It remaines then that the sanctification which I call matrimoniall, is here meant, which I expresse in *Beza's* words, thus: *Fidelis uxor potest cum infideli marito bona conscientia consue-scere (cur enim aliena conscientia eam pollueret) idcirco dicitur infide-lis ille non in seipso, sed in uxore (id est uxoris respectu) sanctus esse, idem quoque de altero membro judicandum est.* That this may be the sense, I gather from the like use of the word, ἁγιάζεται 1 *Tim.* 4. 5.

where the *creature of God is said to be sanctified*, that is, lawfully used, in opposition to that which is to be refused; so here, *the unbelieving husband is sanctified*, that is, lawfully enjoyed as a husband, by, or to, or in respect of his wife, whether believer, or unbeliever, in this case there is no difference. And this your own words in port, pag. 24. When you thus speake. *He saith indeed, the unbelieving wife is sanctified in the believing husband, or to the believing husband; that is, to his use, as all other creatures are, as the bed he lies on, the meat he eats, the cloaths he wears, and the beast he rides on are sanctified to his use.* And this sense is the more confirmed, in that, ἁγιασμὸς, *sanctification*, is the same with chastity, 1 Thes. 4.7. So that the sense is, the *unbelieving husband is sanctified to his wife*, that is, lawfully or chastly, used as a husband, without fornication in respect of his own wife, whether believer or unbeliever, and therefore not to be refused. And this sense only serves for the purpose of the Apostle. The words are a reason why they might lawfully live together: the reason must be taken from that which was not contingent, but certain, as *Chamier* saith truly, *tom. 4. Panstrat. Cathol. l. 5. c. 10. §. 66. Hæc est mens Apostoli, ut doceat fideli non discedendum a conjuge infideli, consentiente in habitationem; cui rei conficiendæ ineptum est æque ac paulo ante argumentum ab eventu incerto ac per accidens, hinc refutatur illa sententia quæ imaginatur tandem cum etiam infidelis conversus erit generatum iri filios sanctos: Nam quid si nunquam fiat?* Take it then in your sense, it had been no satisfactory reason. You may live together, though one party be an unbeliever, because you may beget a holy seed; but this was meerly contingent, uncertain, and by accident, not arising from their present estate, but from something future, which might not be, possibly they might have no children at all: how shall persons then be satisfied from this reason? But in the other acception of matrimoniall sanctification, the reason is plain and satisfactory: Let them, if they will, live together, though one be a believer, the other an unbeliever; for though there be difference in Religion, yet marriage continues still, they are husband and wife, and are so sanctified to each others use, in respect of their chaste enjoyment of each other, and it is no sin for them to accompany together, notwithstanding the unbelief of the one party; for marriage is honorable among all, even unbelievers, and the bed undefiled, *Heb.* 13.4. And Holinesse and Honour are terms of like sense in this matter, 1 Thes. 4.7. And the like resolution the Apostle gives, vers. 17. 20. concerning

concerning circumcised or uncircumcised persons and servants, they might continue circumcised and uncircumcised persons and servants to their masters, notwithstanding their Christian calling, it did not dissolve those relations; so that to me it is very cleare, that the sanctification here spoken of is matrimonial sanctification. As for instrumentall sanctification, for the begetting a holy seed, I know not of any before Mr. *Thomas Goodwin* that hath so expounded it; But *Beza* and many others expound it of matrimoniall sanctification. Which is further confirmed in that the Apostle when he speakes of the believing party, saith not the believing wife or husband, but *the husband or Wife*, which is to me a plaine evidence, that the Apostle placeth the reason of their sanctification, not in the faith of either party, but in the relation of husband and wife. But of this more in the answering of your second argument. Now let this be granted (as of necessity it must) then the uncleanesse must be understood of bastardy, and the holines of legitimation; for no other holines follows necessarily to the children, in that their parents marriage is lawfull, and they borne of such parents, but legitimation nor any other uncleannes follows upon the denying of it but bastardy. And therefore who ever they be that interpret it of legitimation, they doe it rightly, call them how you will. And that I may cleare it, let the Apostles reason be resolved.

To conceive it we are to consider, 1. That the words [*els were, &c.*] are not a resolution of another doubt, but an argument to prove that which was said last, as the particle ἐπὶ ἄρα shews; for the tearmes ἐπὶ ἄρα els were, are argumentative, as much as *quoniam tum*, because then, used so, 1 *Cor.* 15. 14. 29. *Rom.* 11. 6. to prove that which went before. 2. That here the argument is *ab absurdo*, from an absurditie, which would follow, if the thing to be proved were not granted, and the speech must needs be Elliptick: and somwhat is to be repeated to make the speech full, as when it is said, *Rom.* 11. 6. εἰ δὲ χάριτι οὐκ ἔτι ἐξ ἔργων ἐπεὶ ἡ χάρις οὐκ ἔτι γίνεται χάρις, *If by grace, it is no more of workes, else grace were no more grace*: To make the sense full, you must adde, ἐπὶ εἰ ἐξ ἔργων, *because if of workes*: So here, ἐπὶ ἄρα εἰ ὁ ἄπιστος ἡγίασται ἐν τῇ γυναικὶ τέκνα ὑμῶν, &c. *For if the unbelieving husband hath not been sanctified to the wife, your children, &c.* So that this is the argument of the Apostle entire: If the unbelieving husband were not sanctified by the wife, then were your children unclean, but they are not unclean, but holy, *Ergo*, the unbelieving husband

band is sanctified to the wife. Now the Major of this Syllogism is a conditional, and the sequel of it were not true, if this proposition were not true: All the children of those Parents whereof the one is not sanctified to the other are unclean. Now if the sanctification be here meant of Matrimonial sanctificatiō, as I have proved it must, and the uncleanesse be meant of federall uncleannesse, so as to exclude them out of the covenant, whether of Saving-graces, or Church-priviledges, the proposition were most false, sith that children of parents, whereof one was not Matrimonially sanctified to the other, but came together unchastly, as *Pharez* and *Zarah* of Iudah, and *Tamar*, *Iepthe* of Gilead, and many others were within the Covenant of Saving graces, and Church priviledges, and therefore to make the Proposition true (without which the Apostle speakes that which is false) it must be understood of uncleanneſse by bastardy: for it is true of no other uncleanneſse, that all children of those parents, whereof the one is not sanctified to the other are uncleane. And that this is the force of the Apostles reasoning, *Chamier* saw, *Panstr. Cathol. tom. 4. lib. 5. c. 10. §. 67.* when arguing against the conceit ascribed to *Augustine* concerning Ceremoniall holinesse, he saith thus. *De ceremoniali illa sanctitate quid dicam? venit in mentem Augustino, sed Deus bone! quam aliena? profecto quædam sunt tam absurda ut refutari non mereantur. Euge. Dixit Apostolus, si non sanctificetur maritus infidelis in vxore fideli futurum ut filij inde nati sint impuri, ergo omnes sic nati sunt impuri aut falsum dixit Apostolus. Quid ergo? Omnesne nati ex ijs parentibus quorum alter non sanctificatur in altero geniti sunt in menstruis? Nunquamne Infideles utuntur uxoribus nisi menstruatis? ita oportet sane aut hanc ridiculam esse interpretationem.* I may apply the same words to *Chamier* his interpretation of *fœderall sanctity*. *De fœderali illa sanctitate quid dicam? venit in mentem Chamiero, Calvino, &c. Sed Deus bone! quam aliena? profecto quædam sunt tam absurda ut refutari non mereantur; Euge. Dixit Apostolus, si non sanctificetur maritus infidelis in uxore futurum ut filij inde nati sint impuri ergo omnes sic nati sunt impuri, aut falsum dixit Apostolus, quid ergo? Omnesne nati ex ijs parentibus quorū alter non sanctificatur in altero sunt extra fœdus gratiæ? Nunquāne parentes infideles aut fornicantes gignunt liberos intra fœdus gratiæ futuros, ita oportet sane aut ridiculam hanc esse interpretationem.* As for the other words, *but now are they holy*; the particle νυν δε but now, is not an adverbe of time here, as

Bez.

Beza rightly, but as ἐπεὶ ἄρα else were, so νῦν ἄρα but now, is a particle of reasoning used in the assumption of arguments, which shews it is the assumption of the Apostles argument, and therefore it must be understood of holinesse opposite to the uncleanenesse mentioned, but that being no other then bastardy, the holinesse can be meant of no other, then legitimation. Nor is this any whit an unlikely sense, such bastards were reckoned among uncleane persons. *Deut.* 23. 2. and the Apostles expression may be allusive to the Iewish speaking or estimation. And why it should be thought strange, that holy should signifie legitimate, I know not, when as *Mal.* 2. 15. זרע אלהים *a seed of God*, rendred by your selfe, page 19. *a holy seed*, is all one with a legitimate seed, as *Calvin* rightly expounds it, and the words must be understood; for they speak of the first institution of marriage, which was not to seek a seed of God distinct from the wicked (for it is spoken of the generall end of all marriages) but a lawfull seed: whereto I may adde, that marriage hath had the reputation of *a holy estate*, as the Liturgie calls it, and as that excellent booke intituled, *The union of Christ and the Church in a shadow*, by R. C. proves. As for Mr. *Blakes* quære, pag. 11. *Whether we will give the like interpretation of* Gal. 2. 15. *which is, saith he, every way parallel, and answers in either of the branches? Doth the Apostle here meane we that are by birth legitimate, and not bastards of the Gentiles.* I may apply to him the words of him in the Poet. *Cernimus, an qui amant ipsi sibi somnia fingunt?* Doe we see? or doe they that love, faine dreames to themselves? for I cannot tell how to interpret this passage, *that* 1 Cor. 7 14. *and* Gal. 2. 15. *are every way parallel*, and the one to be interpreted by the other, any otherwise then as a conceit in a dream, like as when the fancy from gold and a mountaine compounds a golden mountain. And for his argument which he drawes from the text, on which his discourse is builded, in that the Apostle contra distinguisheth, "*Jews* "*by nature, and sinners of the Gentiles*, (which the phrase shews the Apostle useth after the vulgar manner; for otherwise Jewes are by nature sinners, as well as the Gentiles) to prove "*that the Infants of* "*believers are in the Covenant of grace, and have a birth-priviledge* "*for baptisme*, it is a riddle to mee. The meaning of the words is plainly this; we are born Jews and not Gentiles who are reputed sinners, yet we know that a man is not justified by the works of the law, to observe which by birth we were tied, and therfore *Peter* did ill to compell

Grot. annot. in Mat. 19 5. nulla autem arctior amicitia quàm mariti & uxoris, quæ communionem requirit affectuum, corporis, prolis vitæ denique totius: quam rem esse vere sacram, id est, non humanitus, sed divinitus, repetam magno consensu gentes credidêrunt.

compel the Gentiles to Judaize, to keep the law of *Moses*, thereby dissembling the libertie they had in Christ, and bringing them into bondage; so that it is plaine he mentions Jewes by nature, to shew their obligation to the law by their birth, and he calls the Gentiles sinners, according to the common expression of them, as not observing the law of the Jews, and therefore when Mr. *Blake* saith, "*That he contends* "*to have the seed of believing Parents under the Gospel, to be under the* "*first member of the division in the text.* It is a strange speech, that he should contend to prove this, The seed of believing Gentiles are Jews by nature, born to be circumcised, and to keepe Moses law. But let it be granted, that they are called sinners in the sense he would have it, that is, *out of the Covenant*, as it is said, Ephes. 2. 12. the question is, in what sense the Gentiles were without the Covenant, and the Jewes in. It is certaine the Jews had by Gods appointment the priviledge of circumcision, and the Covenant made with *Abraham* did belong to them in speciall manner, and the Oracles were with them, *Rom.* 9. 4, 5. and the Covenant of Saving-grace was among them, till they were by unbeliefe broken off, and that the Gentiles were *dogs, uncleane persons, aliens from the commonwealth of* Israel, *Without God, Without Christ, &c.* And so it may be granted that the Jews had a birth privledge, though it is certaine, that their birth did not intitle them to the Covenant of grace, and that the common priviledge of circumcision belonging to the Jews, did not arise from the Covenant of grace, accoding to the substance of it, but according to the administration that then was, nor was a fruit of the faith of the parents, but of Gods appointment according to the dispensation of his will, in that time of the churches minoritie; but he that will prove, that therefore our children have such a birth priviledge, because the Jews had, must make our case as the Jews, and so bring us under the Ceremoniall law. But of this wee shall have occasion hereafter to speake more fully, onely by the way I thought it necessary to say so much, because Master *Vines* referres us to Master *Blakes* Sermon as a learned treatise, and I heard it in like manner magnified by Master *Calamy*, and therefore have thought it necessary some where or other to examine what hath any seeming strength in it. And for the same reason I take notice of that speech of Master *Blake*, page 11. "*Singular* "*opinions put men upon singular interpretations*; which may as truely be verified of himselfe, as of his adversaries, in that which occasioned

fioned him so to speake. Another booke lately publiſhed, being the treatiſe of one Mr. *William Cook*, and commended by Maſter *Francis Woodcocke*, one of your Aſſembly, as I conceive, in the 62. page of it ſaith. "*Who ever before (but* Bellarmine, *or ſuch Ieſuiticall in-*"*terpreters of Scripture) tooke it ſo, putting uncleane for baſtards,* "*or holy for legitimate.* And in the Margin, *Note Reader, that this is* "Bellarmines *interpretation*, and after, *whether A. R. borrowed this* "*anſwer of* Bellarmine, *or invented it of himſelfe (as it is the happineſſe* "*of the good wits, and holy affections of Ieſuiticall and Anabaptiſti-*"*call heads and hearts to jump in the ſame thing) let others judge.* Mr. *Woodcock* had done well to have left out this paſſage: For, firſt, although I have not now *Bellarmines* booke by me, to examine whether it be his interpretation or no, yet I perceive by *Chamier*, *Panſtr. Cathol. tom.* 4. *lib.* 5. *cap.* 10. §. 55. who ſaith thus, *Hoc obſervato Bellarminum e tribus quas enumerat, non indicare quam cui præferat, quaſi nihil intereſſet*, This being obſerved, that Bellarmine, of the three ſenſes which he reckons, doth not ſhew which he preferres, as if it were of no behoofe; That that Author did not well heed Bellarmine, when he makes it his opinion, becauſe he numbers it amongſt other opinions. Secondly, that Authour not only erroneouſly, but alſo otherwiſe in an unfitting way, makes it a Jeſuiticall interpretation only, whereas he might have perceived that Bellarmine cites others then Jeſuites for that interpretation; and if he be not to be believed, yet *Chamier* might be believed, who ſaith in the ſame place, §. 50. *Sic Ambroſium, Thomam, Anſelmum expoſuiſſe, & hunc Suarez appellat literalem ſenſum*: That *Ambroſe, Thomas, Anſelme*, ſo expounded it, and this *Suarez* cals the literall ſenſe. And before *Bellarmine*, *Muſculus* in his Commentarie on 1 Cor. 7. 14. alleageth *Ambroſe* and *Hierome* ſo expounding it, and confeſſeth that though he had abuſed formerly that place againſt the Anabaptiſts, yet he found that of matrimoniall ſanctification and ſanctity, to be the right ſenſe. And *Melanthon*, and *Camerarius* doe expound it of legitimation: *Gagnæus Pariſienſis, in loc.* alſo ſo expounds it: and *Oſiander, Enchir. controv. cum Anab. p. c.* 2. *q.* 3. *Mariana ſchol. in loc.* And as for that of Fœderal holineſſe, I have rather reaſon to conceive it to be a new expoſition, the Ancients expounding it otherwiſe, None that ever I met with, expounding it of federall

holineſſe, till the controverſie of the Anabaptiſts in Germanie aroſe.

"You ſay, *But this cannot be the meaning, I clearly prove by theſe "foure arguments. Firſt, uncleanneſſe and holineſſe, when oppoſed one "to the other, are never taken for civilly lawfull.* Nor do I like the calling of it civill holineſſe, for it is not from the lawes of men, but the inſtitution of God, and therefore I rather call it marrimoniall holineſſe. You ſay, "*Vncleaneſſe, indeed, when oppoſed to cleaneſſe, "may be taken in ſeverall ſenſes, An unclean veſſel, an unclean cloth, "an unclean garment, when oppoſed to clean, may ſignifie nothing but "dirty or ſpotted: but when uncleaneſſe is oppoſed to holineſſe, it is al- "wayes taken in a ſacred ſenſe, referring to a tabernacle uſe, to a right "of admiſſion into, or uſe in the tabernacle or temple, which were types "to us of the viſible church; and holineſſe is alwayes taken for a ſepa- "ration of perſons or things from common to ſacred uſes.* It is hard for you to make good, nor is it materiall for me to diſprove that which you ſay, "*That when uncleaneſſe is oppoſed to holineſſe, it is alwayes "taken in a ſacred ſenſe, referring to a tabernacle uſe, to a right of ad- "miſſion into, or uſe in the tabernacle or temple, which were types to "us of the viſible church.* For if it were true, yet the ſenſe I give might ſtand good, ſith uncleaneſſe for baſtardy might be taken alluſively to the tabernacle, if the excluſion of baſtards from the congregation of the Lord, were an excluſion from the tabernacle; and ſo the ſenſe might be good, that uncleaneſſe is baſtardy, though that which you ſay were true, that uncleaneſſe, as oppoſed to holineſſe, refers to a tabernacle uſe. Howſoever it is enough, that I have proved, that the word *uncleaneſſe* muſt be taken here for *baſtardy*, if the Apoſtles reaſon ſtand good. Yet let me intreat you to look a little on that text, 1 *Theſ.* 4. 7. and tell me, whether *uncleaneſſe* there be not oppo- "ſed to *holineſſe*, and whether it be taken in a ſacred ſenſe, referring "to a tabernacle uſe, to a right of admiſſion into, or uſe in the taber- "nacle or temple, which were types to us of the viſible church. Me thinks, by *uncleaneſſe* is meant fornication, and by *holineſſe*, chaſtity; and that comes very near the adjectives for *baſtards*, and *legitimate*, which are conſequent on fornication, and lawfull generation. And the words of the Apoſtle, 2 *Cor.* 7. 1. oppoſing *filthineſſe of the fleſh*, to *holineſſe*, makes me conceive you were miſtaken in your ſpeech, when you ſay, "*In that oppoſition, uncleaneſſe is alwayes taken*

"*in*

" *in a ſacred ſenſe.* And when you ſay, that *Holineſſe is always taken* " *for a ſeparation of perſons and things, from common to ſacred uſes.* Me thinks you might have conſidered, that 1 *Theſ.* 4 3. the holy Ghoſt ſaith thus: *This is the will of God,* ὁ ἁγιασμὸς ὑμῶν, *your holineſſe*, i.e. ſaith *Beza*, that *you abſtain from fornication.* Now, abſtinence from fornication, you will not ſay is ſeparation from common to ſacred uſes. And when the Apoſtle ſaith, 1 *Cor* 7.34. *that ſhe may be holy in body*, is it not meant, that ſhe may be chaſte?

You go on. " *Even the meats and drinks of believers, ſanctified to* " *them, ſerve for a religious end and uſe, to refreſh them who are the* " *temples of the Holy Ghoſt.* Is it a religious end and uſe, to refreſh them who are the temples of the Holy Ghoſt? Then the godly, in eating and drinking, do an act of religion, becauſe they refreſh themſelves. It is true, when their meats are ſanctified to them, they uſe them religiouſly, but not becauſe they refreſh their bodies, which are the temples of the Holy Ghoſt, but becauſe they uſe them with the word, and prayer. It refreſhing the temple of the Holy Ghoſt, be a religious uſe and end, then the inordinate eating of a godly man, or the feeding of a godly man by a prophane perſon, is a religious uſe and end. You adde, " *So that they have not only a lawfull, but a holy* " *uſe of their meat and drink, which unbelievers have not, to whom* " *yet their meat and drink is civilly lawfull.* This is true; but how this proves, that *unclean* may not be taken for *baſtard*, and *holy* for *legitimate*, I ſee not.

You go on. " *And whereas ſome ſay*, 1 Theſ. 4.3.4 5. *that Chaſtity,* " *a morall vertue found among heathens, is called by the name of San-* " *ctification:* Let every one poſſeſſe his veſſell, not in the luſt of con- " cupiſcence, but in ſanctification and honour. *I anſwer, Chaſtity* " *among heathens is never called ſanctification, but among believers it* " *may be called ſo, being a part of the new creation, a branch of their* " *ſanctification wrought by the ſpirit of God, a part of the inward a-* " *dorning of the temple of the holy Ghoſt.* But this is but a ſhift; for why may not an unbeliever be ſaid, as well to poſſeſſe his veſſell in holines, as to be ſanctified? Beſides, are not ſanctification, and cleanneſſe, and honour, all one in theſe paſſages? And doth not the Apoſtle ſay, *Heb.* 13 4. that *Marriage is honourable among all,* (even Infidels) *and the bed undefiled*? And though the word ἁγιασμὸς holineſſe, be not found among the heathen writers, as being

being (so farre as I can finde) a word used only among Ecclesiasticall writers; yet ἁγιεύω is used for *castimoniam servo*, I preserve chastity: as *Stephanus*, in his *Thesaurus*, observes out of *Demosthenes* καλὰ Νεαίρᾳ, where a Priest of *Bacchus* speaks thus: ἁγιεύω γὰρ καθαρὸς εἰμὶ ἀπὸ ἀνδρὸς συνουσίας, I am holy and pure from the company of man. And the words, ἁγνὸς, ἁγνεύω, ἁγνίζω, ἁγνεία, chaste, to be chaste, to make chaste, chastity; comming from the same root with ἅγιος holy: whether ἅζω to reverence, or ἄγαμαι to admire, as Grammarians conceive, are used for holinesse and chastity, very frequently, both in Scripture, and in all sorts of Greek writers. So that what you say, that [*holy*] cannot be taken for [*legitimate*] but must be taken for persons admissible into the Church; It is so farre from being true, that notwithstanding any thing you have said, yet that sense both may and must be, if the Apostles reasoning be good. But you assault it with a second Argument.

Grot annot. in Mat. 5. 8. So ent pro eodem usurpari ἁγνὸς & καθαρὸς.

"*Secondly, this being so, had this been the meaning,* Else were "your children uncleane, but now they are holy; *Else had* "*your children been bastards, but now they are legitimate:* "*The Apostles answer had not been true, because if then one of* "*the parents had not been a believer, and so by being a believer* "*sanctified his unbelieving wife, their children must have been* "*bastards: whereas We know their children had been legitimate,* "*being borne in lawfull wedlock, though neither of the parents* "*had been a believer. Marriage, being a Second Table-duty,* "*is lawfull (though not sanctified) to Pagans, as well as to* "*Christians: and the legitimation, or illegitimation of the issue* "*depends not upon the faith, but upon the marriage of the pa-* "*rents; Let the marriage be lawfull, and the issue is legiti-* "*mate, whether one, or both, or neither of the parents be be-* "*lievers, or infidels: Take but away lawfull marriage betwixt* "*the man and the Woman, and the issue is illegitimate, whether* "*one, or both, or neither of the parents are believers, or infidels.* "*Withall, if the children of heathens be bastards, and the marriage* "*of heathens no marriage; then there is no adultery among hea-* "*thens, and so the seventh Commandement is altogether vain in the* "*words of it, as to them.*

This

This is indeed the principall reason that hath prevailed with many, to interpret this passage of federall holinesse, not of matrimoniall; because they conceive here is a priviledge ascribed to the believing wife, or husband, in respect of the faith of the one person, not common to such with infidels. Whereas the holinesse here expressed is not from the quality of faith, but from the relation of husband and wife. For that onely was agreeable to the Apostles purpose: to assure them that in the disparity of religion they might live together still, because the unbeliever, though an unbeliever, notwithstanding his infidelity, is and hath been still lawfully injoyed and sanctified to his wife. So that the force of the Apostles reason is taken from the lawfulnesse of marriage amongst infidels. This was so plaine to *Chanier. tom.* 4. *Panstr. Cathol. lib.* 5. *cap.* 10. *sect.* 63. that he writes thus; *Hoc argumento excluditur ea sanctitas quam nonnulli prætulerunt ab educatione, nam ab ista penitùs delumbatur argumentum Apostoli. Hæc enim incerta est: nôrunt enim omnes, & docet experientia, neque omnes viros lucrifieri, quod etiam innuit Apostolus, neq; omnes liberos obsecundare sanctæ educationi. Præterea si qui obsecundent, tamen hic effectus est accidentalis, non autem ex ipsius matrimonii naturâ.* And this is confirmed, that the sanctification of the husband, and the holinesse of the children, comes from the nature of marriage, because the Apostle when he speaks of the unbelieving party, names him or her, under the terme of unbelieving husband or wife, because the doubt was of the unbeliever, in respect of his unbeliefe; but when he speakes of the believing party, how ever the vulgar Latine thrusts in [*believing*] twice, and one old copy *Beza* found, that had in the Margin, πιστῇ & πιστῷ, believing wife and believing husband, and a copy of *Clermont* had ἐν ἀνδρὶ ἀδελφῷ, to the husband a brother, yet all the copies besides reade simply without that Epithet [*to the wife, to the husband*] without believing. The reason cannot be conceived rightly to be any other, but that although the person meant were a believer, as well as a wife or a husband; yet in this passage they were considered onely as husband or wife, and not as believers; to intimate that the sanctification did not come from the faith of the party, but from conjugall relation. So that whereas you say, that upon the interpretation given, it would follow that there would be no lawfull marriage amongst heathens, or legitimate children, because you conceive the sanctification & holinesse here proper to believers and their children, the con-

trary is moſt true, and moſt agreeable to the Apoſtles meaning, who doth not here aſcribe the ſanctification, either of the unbeliever, or the children, to the faith of either partie, but to the conjugall relation, and mentions here no priviledge, but what was common to all married perſons amongſt the heathens. Thus is your principall argument anſwered; I paſſe on to the next.

"*You ſay beſides S^t Pauls reaſon had no ſtrength in it, ſuppoſing the text* "*were to be interpreted as theſe men would have it. Their doubt (ſay they)* "*was that their marriage was an unlawfull wedlocke, and ſo conſequently* "*their children baſtards.* You doe not herein rightly ſet downe your adverſaries explication of the Apoſtle; the doubt was onely, whether the beleever might continue with the unbeliever in conjugall uſe: the Apoſtles reſolution was they might, for they were ſanctified each to other, notwithſtanding the unbeliefe that was in the one partie; for if it were otherwiſe, their children were baſtards. There was no doubt, as you ſay, of their childrens baſtardy; the Apoſtles reaſon ſuppoſeth it was out of doubt with them. You adde. "*Now marke* "*what kinde of anſwer they make the Apoſtle give. Were you not lawfull* "*man and wife, your children were baſtards; but becauſe the unbelieving* "*wife is ſanctified in the husband, &c. becauſe your marriage is a lawfull* "*marriage, your children are legitimate. What ſtrength of reaſon is in this?* "*if this had been their doubt or queſtion, whether their marriage were not* "*a nullitie; the Apoſtle by his Apoſtolike authoritie, might have definitive-*"*ly anſwered, without giving a reaſon, your marriage is good, and your* "*children legitimate. But if Paul will goe about to ſatisfie them by rea-*"*ſon, and prove them to be miſtaken, it behoved him to give ſuch a reaſon,* "*which ſhould have ſome weight in it, but this hath none. Set their doubt* "*(as theſe men frame it) and the Apoſtles anſwer (as theſe men interpret* "*it) together, and you will eaſily ſee the invalidity of it. Wee doubt (ſay* "*the Corinthians) wee are not lawfull man and wife, and that therefore* "*our children are baſtards. No, ſaith Paul, you are miſtaken, and I prove* "*it thus; Were you not lawfull man and wife, your children were baſtards,* "*but becauſe you are lawfull man and wife, your children are not baſtards.* "*Is there any argument or proofe in this?*

As you frame your adverſaries meaning, it may be thought ridiculous, but your miſtakes muſt not be charged on them for their errour. All this paſſage of yours is built on this, that you make that the doubt which was not the doubt, to wit, whether their children were

were baſtards, and make that the concluſion, which is the *medium* to prove the concluſion by; for it was ſo far from being a doubt whether their children were baſtards, that the Apoſtle argues from this as an abſurditie he knew they would not grant, and therefore ſuppoſed this to be without doubt with them, that their children were not baſtards, but legitimate. And herein Mr *Thomas Goodwin* ſpake rightly, *that the Apoſtle ſuppoſed it to be a received principle with them*, though his paraphraſe, but *now are they holy, that is, you ſee your children baptized*, is his owne comment, and that not onely a very bold, but abſurd one, that I ſay no worſe of it. And whereas you ſay, the Apoſtle might by his Apoſtolike authoritie, have definitively anſwered, 'tis true, and ſo he did, as appeares from *ver.* 12. and yet he might give a reaſon *ad homines, to the men*, to convince them, which it may be, as you make it, is invalide, but rightly conceived, as the Apoſtle framed it, is convincing and cogent.

"You ſay. *Fourthly, according to this their interpretation, the Apoſtles* "*anſwer could no way have reached to the quieting of their conſciences*; "*their doubt was whether according to the example in* Ezra, *they were not* "*to put away their wives and children, as not belonging to God, as being* "*a ſeed whom God would not owne among his people. Now what kinde* "*of quiet would this have given them, to tell them that their children were* "*not baſtards? Wee know the* Jewes *did not put away their baſtards, as* "*not belonging to the Covenant of God,* Pharez, *and* Zarah, *and* Jepthah, "*and innumerable others, though baſtards, were circumciſed, and not cut* "*off from the people of God.*

All this argument is grounded on a miſtake, as if the queſtion were, *whether they were to put away their wives and children, as not belonging to God, and that according to the example in* Ezra. Whereas that is but a conjecture, that they had any relation in this matter to the action mentioned in *Ezra*: and ſome other occaſion is as likely, if not more likely, as hath been ſhewed, and it is certaine there were no doubts at all about the putting away of their children; for the Apoſtles argument proceeds upon this as a thing undoubted with them, that their children were not uncleane, but holy. What their doubt indeed was, and how the Apoſtles anſwer fits it is ſhewed before.

"You goe on. *And whereas ſome object out of* Deut. 23. 2. *that baſtards* "*did not belong to the Covenant among the Jewes, becauſe God there forbad* "*a baſtard to come into the Congregation of the Lord. I anſwer, that is*

 "*meant*

"meant onely of bearing office in the Church, or some such like thing; and "not of being under the Covenant belonging to the Church; as is manifest "not onely by what hath been now said of Jepthah, and others, who were "circumcised, and offered sacrifices, and drew nigh to God, as well as any "other, but the very Text alledged gives sufficient light, that it cannot be "meant otherwise, because in that place who ever is an Eunuch or wound-"ed in his stones, hath the same exclusion from the Congregation of the "Lord, and I hope that none will dare to say, that none such are holy to the "Lord; if they should, the Scripture is full enough against them; that put-"ting away in Ezra was of an higher nature then illegitimation, and there-"fore it behooved the Apostle to give another manner of satisfaction to their "doubtfull consciences, then to tell them their children were not bastards. "Therefore I conclude, that this holinesse being the fruit of one of the Pa-"rents being a believer, must be meant of some kinde of holinesse which is "not common to the seed of them whose parents are both believers, and that "is enough for our purpose.

What others object I know not, the Text, *Deut.* 23. 2. was produced by mee in my papers in Latin, above-mentioned, in these words, *Et quidni simili allusione ponatur ἀκάθαρτα pro spuriis, ἅγια pro legitimis, nam spurius inter impuros, Deut.* 23. 2. And why may not by a like allusion, uncleane be put for bastards, and holy for legitimate? for the bastard is put among the uncleane, *Deut.* 23. 2. By which you may perceive, that I produced it not to prove, that bastards did not belong to the Covenant among the *Jewes*, or were to be denied circumcision, or to be put away, and therefore in what respect they are to be excluded from the Congregation of the Lord, is not to my purpose materiall, but onely to shew, that bastards were reckoned among uncleane persons by the Law; which I thinke, you will not deny, sith you confesse they were excluded from bearing office in the Church, or some such like thing; and therefore the Apostle might fitly by allusion put uncleane for bastards. Against this there being nothing in your answer, nor any thing else, which hath not been replyed to before, I passe to the two objections you bring in against your interpretation.

You say, "Yet there remain two Objections to be answered, which are "made against this our interpretation: First, the unbelieving wife, is here "said to be sanctified as well as the child is said to be holy; and the originall "word is the same for both, one the Verb, the other the Noune; if then the "childe

"childe is holy, with a federall holinesse, then is also the unbelieving wife "sanctified with a federall sanctification; and so the wife, although re- "maining a Heathen, may be counted to belong to the Covenant of Grace. "I answer, indeed there would be weight in this Objection, if the Apostle "had said, The unbelieving wife is sanctified, and no more, as he simply "saith the children are holy; but that he doth not say: He saith indeed, "the unbelieving wife is sanctified in the believing husband; or, to the "believing husband, that is, to his use, as all other creatures are; as the bed "he lies on, the meat he eats, the clothes he wears, the beast he rides on, are "sanctified to him; and so this sanctifiednesse of the wife, is not a sancti- "fication of state, but only of use, and of this use to be sanctified to the be- "lieving husband, whereas the holinesse and sanctification that is spoken "of the children is a holinesse of state, and not only a sanctification to "the parents use.

These words in your Margin [ἐν, the Greek Preposition, signifying to, as well as in, as Gal. 1. 16. 2 Pet. 1. 5. Acts 4. 12. 1 Cor. 7. 15.] being the Texts I produce in my Latin paper, that [ἐν] may be translated [to] as well as [by] give me some occasion to think that this Objection is produced in reference to these words in my Latin paper, where arguing against the rendring of [ἐν by] as if the faith of the wife were the cause of the sanctifying the unbelieving husband; I say thus: *Nemo enim dixerit fidem uxoris sanctificare virum infidelem fœderaliter, ita ut baptismi capax sit infidelis maritus propter fidem uxoris (quod tamen pace tantorum virorum dictum sit, tam benè sequitur ex hoc loco, quam filium sanctum esse fœderaliter, & baptismi capacem propter fidem parentis)* for no man will say, the faith of the wife sanctifies the unbelieving husband federally, so that the unbelieving husband should be capable of Baptisme for the faith of the wife (which yet, with the leave of so great persons be it said, doth as well follow out of this place, as that the sonne is federally holy, and capable of baptisme for the faith of the parent). In which words, when I say, *it follows out of this place*, my meaning is, so translated and expounded as before; that the unbelieving husband is sanctified by, that is, by the faith of the wife, as the child is holy, it would follow, that the unbelieving husband should be in the Covenant as well as the child, and so be baptized: for the faith of the wife is said to sanctifie according to this reading and exposition, the one as well as the other. And so much I conceive you acknowledge, in saying

in

in this Objection, there would be weight if the Apostle had said the unbelieving wife is sanctified and no more. But this only I put in by a parenthesis, as not building the main of the interpretation I gave on it, knowing that *Beza* renders it [*in uxore*, in the wife] and then the Objection hath no place. And seeing you do render [*in*] *in*, or *to*, and expound the sanctification to the believers use, as all other creatures are. I confesse, against you that Objection is not in force, and therefore your answer may be acknoweldged right in this particular. I passe to the second Objection.

"*That holinesse of the children is here meant, which could not be unless one of the parents were sanctified to the other; which is the force of the Apostles arguing, the unbeliever is sanctified to the believer, else were not the children holy, but unclean; but federall holinesse of children may be where parents are not sanctified, one in, or to the other: as in bastardy.* Davids *childe by* Bathsheba, Pharez *and* Zarah Judah's *children by* Thamar, *the* Israelites *children by the Concubines*, Abrahams *son* Ishmael *by* Hagar, *&c. in which case the children were federally holy, and accordingly were circumcised, and yet the Harlot not sanctified, in, or to the Adulterer, or Fornicator, though a Believer.*

This Objection I own, having first proved that the sanctification of the unbeliever, is meant of lawfull conjugall copulation, only where you say, *the unbeliever is sanctified to the believer*, I would say as the Apostle doth, *to the wife or husband:* Now to this Objection you say, "*I answer*, but I pray you tell me where you answer it, I finde no answer to it here, except it be an answer to an Argument to deny the conclusion. In the Argument you neither shew faultinesse in the form nor matter, which was the way of answering I learned in the Schools where I was bred. You say, "*we must attend the Apostles scope:* true, but when we are to answer, we must attend to the Objection, and shew the weakneſse of it. You say, "*which is to shew, that the children would be unholy if the faith, or believership of one of the parents, could not remove the barre which lies in the other, being an unbeliever, against the producing of an holy seed, because one of them was a Pagan or unbeliever, therefore the childe could not be a holy seed, unlesse the faith or believership of the other parent could remove this barre.*

You made the scope at first right, to resolve them whether they might lawfully retain their Infidell wives or husbands; but the scope you

you now give, is but a meer figment, not the Apostles.

You say, "*now this can have no place of an argument in any case* "*where one of the parents is not an Infidel.*

I know not what you mean in this passage, unless it be you would answer thus; the Apostles scope is otherwise then the objector takes it, therefore he can make no argument, nor objection, and so I need not make any answer, which is a kinde of answering I am not acquainted with.

You go on: "*But this was not the case amongst the* Jews, Hagar "*and* Thamar, *and the concubines, however sinfull in those acts, yet* "*themselves were Believers, belonging to the Covenant of God, and that* "*barre lay not against their children, as it did in the unbelieving* "*wife.*

This passage is indeed a grant of the *Minor* in the objection, that children may be federally holy, where the one parent is not sanctified to the other; and that the *Major* is true, which rests on this, that the children could not be holy, unless one parent were sanctified to the other, you will not deny it; you do your self frame the force of the Apostles reason thus; both *pag.* 19. when you say, *were it with them, as when both of them were unbelievers their children would be an unclean progeny:* and *pag.* 21. when you say, *the Apostles answer had not been true, because then, if one of the parents had not been sanctified to his unbelieving wife, their children must have been bastards.*

In these and other passages, you acknowledge the force of the Apostles reason, to consist in this: that holinesse of the children is here meant, which could not be, unless one of the parents were sanctified to the other; wherefore the conclusion stands good, that the holinesse here is not federall holinesse.

But you adde, σφρον φαρμακον, a wise remedy. "*Indeed, if a be-* "*lieving man or woman should adulterously beget a child, upon a Pagan* "*or Heathen, or unbeliever, there this objection deserves to be further* "*weighed, but here it comes not within the compasse of the Apostles ar-* "*gument.* This is just *nihil ad rhombum*, nothing to the point; as if you had said, I will not answer the objection which is made, but if you make it thus or thus, I will answer it; and thus I have at last gotten your chief hold, which you had best manned, but in the close you quitted it.

You

You adde as over-measure, certain Reasons:

1. "*From Gods will*, which were enough, if you could prove it.

2. "*From Gods honour, in which you say, so it is with the Lord,* "*he having left all the rest of the world to be visibly the Devils kingdome,* "*will not for his own glories sake permit the Devill to come and lay vi-* "*sible claim to the sons and daughters begotten by those who are the chil-* "*dren of the most High*; which speech, if true, well fare *Cain* and *Cham*, and *Ishmael* and *Esau*, and innumerable others, whom the Devill hath had visible claime to by their works and profession.

3. "*For the comfort and duty of these who are in covenant with him.* Indeed it were a very great comfort, if you could make it good which you say; but we must be content with that comfort God is pleased to give, and not for our comfort speak that of God which is not true.

You say, "*you have been the larger upon those two first conclusions,* "*because indeed, the proving of these gains the whole cause*, and so I have been the larger in answering, as conceiving by loosing these you loose the cause.

You say, "*The most learned of the Anabaptists do professe, that if* "*they knew a child to be holy, they would baptize it.* It is likely they that said, or professed so, did declare in what sense, and for what reason they so spake. But because these are but Rhetoricall passages, I leave them, and passe to your third Conclusion, which you thus expresse.

The

THe Lord hath appointed and ordained a Sacrament or Seal of initiation, to be administred unto them, who enter into covenant with him; Circumcision for the time of that administration which was before Christs incarnation, Baptisme since the time of his incarnation.

§. 9. Of the succession of Baptisme into the place, room, and use of Circumcision.

The conclusion, as you here set it down, may be granted, *that the Lord hath appointed and ordained a Sacrament or Seal of initiation, to be administred to them that enter into covenant with him, circumcision for the time of that administration, which was before Christs incarnation, Baptisme since the time of his incarnation.* But this is not all you would have granted; for it would stand you in no stead, and therefore, in stead of it, *pag.*33. in the Repetition, you put this conclusion for your third; *that our Baptisme succeeds in the room and use of their Circumcision*; and your meaning is, that it so succeeds, *that the command of circumcising Infants should be virtually a command to baptize Infants*, as you expresse your self, *pag.*35. Now this I deny. That which you alledge for this is, First, the agreement that is between Circumcision and Baptisme: Secondly, the Text, *Col.* 2. 8, 9, 10, 11, 12. I shall examine both, and consider whether they fit your purpose.

You confesse *they differ in the outward Elements*, and that is enough to shew that the command for the one, is not a command for the other, except the Holy Ghost do so interpret it. But you say, they agree in five or six particulars. The first, *that they are both of them the same Sacrament for the spirituall part*; which is to be granted, but with its due allowance: For, though Baptisme signifie in part the same thing that Circumcision did; namely, sanctification by the spirit, justification and salvation by Jesus Christ, and faith in him; yet it is true that there is a vast difference betwixt them, because Circumcision signified these things as to be from Christ to come, and therefore it was a sign of the promise of Christ to come from *Isaac*; but Baptisme signifies these things in the name of Christ already manifested in the flesh, crucified, buried, and risen again. And because Circumcision did signifie Christ to come out of *Isaac*, therefore it did also confirm all the promises that were made to *Abrahams* naturall Posterity, concerning their multiplying, their bringing out of *Egypt*, their settling in the Land of *Canaan*, and the yoak of the Law of *Moses*, which was to be in force *till Faith came*, that is, till Christ was manifested in the flesh, *Gal.* 3. 19. 23, 24, 25. *Gal.* 5. 2, 3.

The second agreement you make, is that *both are appointed to be distinguish-*

distinguishing signes betwixt Gods people and the Devils people. This must be also warily understood; for though it be true they are both distinguishing signes, yet not so, but that they may be Gods people, who were not circumcised, nor are baptized. God had a people in *Jobs* and *Lots* families, who were not circumcised, nor to be circumcised; and there may be a people of God, who are not baptized, as the thief on the crosse, the *Catechumeni* dying afore baptisme, many martyrs, and others, that have dyed without Baptisme. And in the signes themselves there is a great difference, both in the acting of them; the one of them was with blood, the other without; the one took away a part of the body, the other not: and after the acting, the one was a permanent signe, the other left no impression or footsteps of it that did remain.

The third agreement is, *both of them the way and means of solemn entrance and admission into the Church*, which may be granted; yet in the solemnity there was a great difference: the one to be done in a private house, by a private person, the other openly by the Minister thereto appointed.

The fourth agreement is, *both of them to be adminstred but once*, which I conceive true thus; to wit, that there is no necessity of administring either of them above once; but a demonstrative Argument to prove it an heresie, or unlawfull in it self to rebaptize, I yet expect. Yet this parity hath its disparity: For Baptisme is not restrained to any set day, but Circumcision was limited to the eighth day in its institution.

Your fifth, *And none might be received into the communion of the Church of the* Jewes, *untill they were circumcised, nor into the communion of the Church of the* Christians, *untill they be baptized.* If you mean by Communion to be accounted members of the Church of the *Jews*, I cannot assent unto you: For not only the children were accounted in that Church who were not eight dayes old, but also all the uncircumcised in the time of the travell through the Wildernesse, untill they came to *Gilgal*, and all the females were members, though they were not to be circumcised. The reason was, because God would have all within that Church that were within the families of *Israel*; and therefore he would have the servants born in the house, and that were bought with money of any stranger that were not of *Abrahams* seed, circumcised. And if you mean by the communion of the Church of *Christians*, the accounting of them as visible members, it is not true that none might be received into the communion of the Church of the

the *Christians* untill they be baptized, unlesse you will with *Bellarmine* deny the *Catechumeni* to be actuall members of the Church, and oppose *Whitaker*, and others of the Protestant Divines herein.

The last agreement is, that *none but the circumcised might eat of the Paschal Lamb*; which is true of those that ought to be circumcised, but it is not true simply taken: for the females were to eat, though not circumcised. On the other side you say, *none may but those who are baptized be admitted to eat the Lords Supper.* This you affirm, but you bring no other proof for it, but the Analogie conceived by you between Circumcision and the Passeover, and Baptisme and the Lords Supper, which can make but a Topick argument, and that *à simili*, which is of all other the weakest Place to prove by, *proportions are weak probation*, saith *Rutherfurd*, Due right of Presbyteries, *Ch.* 2. *Sect.* 2. *p.* 37. 'Tis true, we find persons ordinarily upon their first call were baptized, and then after received the Lords Supper; and it is true, that 1 *Cor.* 10. 2, 3, 4. and 1 *Cor.* 12. 13. baptizing is put before eating and drinking, and therefore thers is ground enough for ordering it so; yet I make question, whether, if a person that professeth the faith of Christ sincerely, and is not yet baptized, suppose for want of a Minister, or out of scruple, at the way of baptizing only allowed, or because the custome is not to baptize but at *Easter* or *Whitsuntide*, as it was of old, or the like reason, should come to a Congregation of *Christians* receiving the Lords Supper, and there receive it with love to Christ, whether he should sin, because not baptized, as the *Jews* should sin, that did eat the Passeover not circumcised: For in the *Jewes* case a command is broken, not here, and so no transgression. If he come without examination of himself, not discerning the Lords body, he sins, he breaks the command, 1 *Cor.* 11. 28. But where is the command that he must be baptized first? And for the same reason, I question, whether a Minister can justifie it before God, if he reject such a *Christian* from the Lords Supper, because not baptized, for the aforesaid reasons. By this which I have said, you may perceive how uncertain your agreements are, and how many disagreements there are between Circumcision and Baptisme; and therefore how poor a proof, or rather none at all may be drawn from the supposed agreements you make between Circumcision and Baptisme, for the making a command to circumcise Infants, a command to baptize Infants, without the Holy Ghost declaring Gods minde to be so. All these agreements; yea, if there were an hundred more, cannot make it any

other than an humane invention, if the Holy Ghost do not shew that they agree in this particular. But to make the weakness of this Argument the more apparent, let me parallel the Priests of the Law, with the Ministers of the Gospel, as you do Circumcision with Baptisme. As God appointed *Aaron* and his sons to Minister in the time of the Law, so the Ministery of the Gospel now; the Apostle makes the Analogy expressly, 1 *Cor.* 9. 13, 14. and far more plainly then the Text you bring for the succession of Baptisme to Circumcision, and they agree in many things: As the Priests lips should preserve knowledge, *Mal.* 2. 7. *Deut.* 33. 10. so must the Bishop be apt to teach, 1 *Tim.* 3. 2. As the Priest by offering the sacrifices held forth Christ to them, *Heb.* 9. so the Minister by preaching, *Gal.* 3. 1. As the Priest was for the people of God, so the Minister of the Gospel: As the High Priest was to have the people on his breast, so the Minister in his heart; as the one was to bless, so the other was to pray for them: As the Priest had a consecration, so the Minister is to have an ordination: As none was to thrust himself into the one without a calling; so neither in the other: And many more such agreements might be assigned; will it therefore follow, that a command to a Priest to offer a sacrifice propitiatory, is a command to a Minister to offer a sacrifice propitiatory, or a command for a Priest to wear a linen Ephod, should be a command to a Minister to wear a Surplice, as the *Papists* do just in your manner argue from Analogy or resemblance; or, that therefore tythes are due to Ministers, *jure divino*, by divine appointment, as Bishop *Carleton*, Dr. *Sclater*, and others, from Analogy of *Melchisedecs* and *Aarons* Priesthood would infer: or that ordination may be by the people; because the children of *Israel* laid hands on the *Levites*, as Mr. *Mather* in answer to Mr. *Herle*; or that there must be an imparity in the Clergy, and so Bishops above Presbyters, as the Prelates, *Bilson*, *Davenant*, *Determinat. Quest.* 42. and others were wont to argue; or that a Doctor in Divinity may be a Justice of Peace, because *Eli* and *Samuel* were Judges, as the Prelaticall Doctors; or that there must be a *Pope*, because there was an *High Priest*, as *Bellarmine* and the *Papists*. If the consequence be not good in the one, neither is it in the other. You say in the next words, *that the Lords Supper succeeds in the room of the Passeover*. This, I confesse, goes current, but the Scripture doth not say so, that I know. The Scripture expressly saith, *that Christ our Passeover was sacrificed for us*, 1 *Cor.* 5. 7. It is true, the Lords Supper was appointed after the Paschal

chal Supper, but it is but our collection, that thereby the Lord would make an end of the Passeover, and substitute the other in its room. In other places we rather finde the Lords Supper to answer the Manna, and the Rock, or water out of the Rock in the Wilderneſſe, 1 *Cor.* 10. 3, 4. It is true, the Apoſtle, 1 *Cor.* 10. 16, 17. argues from the eating of the ſacrifices to the eating of the Lords Supper. But that was not only from the Paſſeover, but from the reſt of the peace-offerings as well as it; yea, from the *Heathens* feaſts upon their ſacrifices. It is true, 1 *Cor.* 5. 8. we are required to keep the feaſt, and the alluſion is to the Paſchal Supper; but whether the keeping the feaſt be meant of the Lords Supper, or as *Beza* paraphraſeth it, *totam vitam in juſtitia & integritate conſumamus*, *let us ſpend our whole life in juſtice and integrity*, or ſomething elſe, *ſub judice lis eſt*, is a controverſie undetermined. But let it be granted, that the Lords Supper imitates (I will not ſay ſucceeds into the room of the *Jewiſh* Paſſeover, for that was a ſacrifice, and Chriſt offered, is only in ſtead of it) the Paſchal Supper, which becauſe of the time, and the form of words uſed in the inſtitution, and ſuch like circumſtances, is very probable, and therefore there is great Analogy between them; yet he that ſhould argue, therefore we muſt receive the Lords Supper with unleavened bread, as the *Papiſts*; or that the bread and wine muſt be firſt conſecrated on an Altar, as was the Paſchal Lamb; or that the Lords Supper is not to be adminiſtred but in a Church, gathered after the Church-way, as the Elders of *New-England*, in anſwer to the nine Poſitions; or that we muſt keep an *Eaſter*, and then have the Lords Supper, as in ancient and later times hath been conceived, you would reject theſe things as ill gathered, and perhaps call them ſuperſtitious. But whether theſe, and more like to them, do not as well follow, as baptizing of Infants, from circumciſion of Infants, becauſe of their Analogy, I leave to your ſelf to conſider. You adde, *And this our Lord himſelf taught us by his own example, who was circumciſed as a profeſſed member of the Church of the* Jews, *and when he ſet up the new Chriſtian Church, he would be initiated into it by the Sacrament of Baptiſme.*

It is confeſſed, that Chriſt was circumciſed and baptized, but that it was to teach us by his example, either your concluſion, or the agreements between Baptiſme and Circumciſion which you ſet down, or that which next goes before your ſpeech, the ſucceſſion of the Lords Supper to the Paſſeover, remains yet to be proved, much more that which

which you drive at, that there is ſuch a parity, or rather identity between Baptiſme and Circumciſion, that the command to circumciſe Infants, is a command to baptize Infants. The circumciſion of Chriſt was undoubtedly as his preſenting in the Temple, and the offering for him to accompliſh the Law, under which it pleaſed him *to be made of a woman*, *Gal.*4.4, 5. and it had a ſpirituall uſe to aſſure our circumciſion *in putting off the body of the ſins of the fleſh*, *Col.*2.11. This is certain, we have cleare Scripture for it; if you ſhall ſhew the like Scriptures for the inferences you make from Chriſts circumciſion, I ſhall imbrace them with both arms. The Baptiſme of Chriſt was that Chriſt might *fulfill all righteouſneſſe*, *Mat.* 3. 15. But how to expound this ſpeech, hath not a little difficulty. Various conjectures there are about the meaning of it: this ſeems to me moſt likely, that righteouſneſſe is there taken for that which was appointed by God, either in ſecret inſtructions, or ſome particular Prophecy from God. But then if it be asked why God did appoint it, this ſeems moſt likely, ſith it is plain that this was the time of Chriſts anointing with the Spirit, as appears, *Luke* 4. 18. that Baptiſme was uſed to ſignifie his anointing by the Spirit for his great function he was then to enter on, which me thinks, the ſtory it ſelf, and the ſpeech of *Peter*, *Acts* 10.37, 38. do evince. That which you ſay, *That being to ſet up the new Chriſtian Church, he would be initiated into it by the Sacrament of Baptiſme*, ſeems not probable; partly, becauſe Chriſt did not ſet up in his own dayes on earth a viſible Church, Diſcipline and Worſhip diſtinct from the *Jewiſh*; partly, becauſe his Baptiſme was of a far higher nature then our Baptiſme, *Who was anointed with the oyl of gladneſſe above his fellows*, *Heb.* 1. 9. and therefore his Baptiſme was of a tranſcendent nature above ours. But if it were granted that Chriſts Baptiſme were to teach us, that he that is a member of the Church, muſt be initiated by baptiſme, it will rather diſadvantage your cauſe then advantage it, ſith Chriſt, who was *the holy One of God, and the Angel of the Covenant, and the ſeed of* Abraham, *in whom all the nations of the earth ſhould be bleſſed, to whom the promiſes were made, in whom the Covenant was confirmed*, Gal.3.16, 17. yet was not baptized, *till he began to be about thirty yeers of age*, Luke 3. 23. So that you ſee how little help you have from your parities, or Chriſts example to prove a like reaſon of circumciſing and baptizing Infants. But you have yet another ſtring to your bow, out of *Col.*2. 11, 12. I will follow you to try the ſtrength of that alſo.

You

You say, *of this conclusion, there is no great doubt; but because some of the* Anabaptists *do deny the Sacrament of Baptisme to succeed into the room, place, and use of Circumcision, be pleased to observe how plain the Apostle makes it,* Col. 2. 8, 9, 10, 11, 12.

It is necessary that I should first consider in what sense your *Position* is to be taken, before I examine your proof for it. The thing that you say the Apostle makes plain, is *that the Sacrament of Baptisme doth succeed in the room, place, and use of Circumcision:* Succession properly notes a coming after another, as we say, Kings succeed one another, High priests one after another. To speak exactly, Baptisme (I do not say the Sacrament of Baptisme) was a concomitant of Circumcision, if not ancienter; For it is well known, that Baptisme was in use among the *Jews*, in the initiating of Proselytes for many yeers together with circumcision, as may be seen in *Selden, de jure naturali, & gentium juxta disciplinam Heb.* lib. 2. cap. 2, 3, 4. *Ainsworth Annot.* on Gen. 17. There is much of this in many Authors beside. But I suppose you cannot be ignorant of what Mr. *Lightfoot* hath in his Sermon, entituled *Elias Redivivus*, pag. 11. where he makes it as ancient as *Jacob. Grotius Annot.* in Mat. 3. 6. hath these words: *Cum verò peregrini ablati & non circumcisi solis legibus tenerentur, quas Deus toti hominum generi dederat, intellectu facile est ablutionem hanc fuisse inter vetera instituta orta, ut arbitror, post magnum diluvium in memoriam purgati mundi: unde illud celebre apud Græcos,* Θάλασσα κλύζει πάντα τ' ἀνθρώπων κακά, *certe baptismum ἀντίτυπον esse diluvio etiam in Petri Epistola legimus.* But it may be the Sacrament of Baptisme came after; neither is that in exactness of speech true, sith Circumcision was a great while in force after *John* began to baptize, which you will not deny to be the same Sacrament with ours. But let it be granted it succeeds, that is, comes after Circumcision, sith it continues now circumcision is taken away, yet the sense in which you can rightly make it *succeed into the room, place, and use of Circumcision*, will be brought into a narrow room, too strait to settle Baptisme of Infants in it.

Room and place are properly either the same, or differ only as *locus communis & proprius*, common place and proper; so Baptisme, which is an action, hath no place or room properly. If you mean by the room and place, the subjects to be baptized, or baptizing, it is not true, except in part; some of the baptized and baptizers only were circumcised, and to be circumcised; some that were not to be circumcised, as women, were to be baptized. If you mean by the room and

place,

place the society into which both persons were to be initiated, it is not true: For by the Sacrament of Baptisme, persons were to be baptized into the Christian Church, by Circumcision into the Jewish, as your own Conclusion saith. If you mean it of the commandment upon which both are seated, neither is that true: the commandement of Circumcision was many ages before Baptisme was instituted as a Sacrament. And for the succession into the use of Circumcision, that is yet more untrue. Your self say a few lines after. *The use of Circumcision engaged men to the use of the rest of the Jewish Ceremonies.* And page 29. *It is true indeed, that circumcision bound them who received it, to conform to that manner of administration of the Covenant*, &c. And if you had not confessed it, it might have been proved out of *Gal.* 5. 2, 3. *Acts* 15. 10. from the custome in circumcising Proselytes, to bind them to the Lawes, not only common to all the *Noachidæ*, but also to all the Laws of the *Jews*, as *Selden, ubi supra*, *Ainsworth* on *Gen.* 17. But I hope you will not dare to say, that Baptisme succeeds Circumcision in this use, if it do, then are we still bound to keep the Law of *Moses*. Another use of Circumcision, was to signifie Christ to come out of *Abrahams* family, I think you will not deny it; if you should, I might plead against you, *Col.* 2. 17. *Gal.* 3. 23, *&c.* the institution of it to be in the males only of *Abrahams* family, by whom the Genealogy was to be reckoned, in the member for generation, the expressions of the Covenant confirmed by it, and the consent of innumerable learned men, both of the *Jewes* and *Christians*: And I think you will not say, Baptisme succeeds into this use of Circumcision: Another use of it was to be a partition wall between the *Jews* and *Gentiles*, to distinguish and divide them, whence the one were counted unclean, as uncircumcised, the other clean, *Eph.* 2. 11. 14. but you will not say, that Baptisme succeeds into this use, sith the use of Baptisme is to the contrary, *Gal.* 3. 26, 27, 28. and surely these were the main uses of it. But you will say, there was use of circumcision for initiation into the Church of the *Jews*, and so of Baptisme. But then, though Baptisme do initiate as Circumcision, yet not into the same Church: For Circumcision did not initiate into any Church, but into the Church of the *Jews*, or rather into the family of *Abraham*; but so doth not Baptisme. If it be said, that the one confirms the Covenant, and so doth the other; still I answer, that Baptisme doth not confirm the same Covenant in every part that circumcision did: For the Covenant was a mixt Covenant, a great part whereof

whereof Baptisme doth not confirm. This is all that can be said, that they agree in that, as circumcision did confirm the spirituall part of the Covenant, to wit, righteousnesse by faith, *Rom.* 4. 11. and signified holinesse of heart; so doth also Baptisme, the like whereof did the Cloud, Sea, Manna, the water out of the Rock, 1 *Cor.* 10. 2, 3, 4, the Deluge or Ark, 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. the sprinkling of the blood of the Sacrifices; and the same are confirmed by the Lords Supper; and why then should we not say, that Baptisme succeeds the flood, sprinkling of blood, as well as Circumcision; and that the Lords Supper succeeds Circumcision as well as Baptisme? Wherefore I conceive your Proposition so generally delivered, *That the Sacrament of Baptisme succeeds into the room, place, and use of Circumcision*, erroneous and very dangerous. But how ever you think, the thing is plainly delivered, *Col.* 2. 8, 9, 10, 11, 12. let us examine that Text then.

You say thus: "*Where the Apostles scope is to dissuade the believing* "*Christians from the rudiments of the world, and Jewish ceremonies and* "*observations upon this ground, that we are compleat in Christ, and that in* "*him, as in the head, the Church hath all perfections.* All this is very right, and the thing very well expressed by *Beza*, *Addendum fuit istud ut non tantum sibi, & in se, sed in nostrum etiam usum statuatur Christus esse talis & tantus, ut nihil in ipso desideretur, & in eo uno omnia nanciscamur ad veram, & salvificam Dei notitiam requisita: Complementum igitur in Christo adeptis quorsum vel humana sapientia, vel vanis hominum commentis, vel ceremoniis, ullo denique extra Christum ascito sit opus? Annot.* in *Col.* 2. 10. where mark that *Beza* rightly makes us so compleat in Christ, that there is no need of any thing added out of Christ in stead of those ceremonies. You go on; "*and because he would take them whol-* "*ly off from Circumcision, the use whereof engaged them to the use of the rest* "*of Jewish ceremonies; he tells them that in Christ we are circumcised with* "*circumcision made without hands, a better circumcision then the* Jews "*was, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh, by the circumcision of* "*Christ.* You say rightly: First, *that the Apostle would take them off wholly from circumcision*, therefore not teach them that they had another Ordinance in stead of it, by vertue of that command: Secondly, *That the use of circumcision, ingaged them to the use of the rest of the Jewish ceremonies*, and therefore that Baptisme succeeds not in the use of Circumcision: Thirdly, *In Christ we are circumcised with a circumcision made without hands, a better circumcision then the* Jews *was, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh, by the circumcision of Christ,*

and therefore we have circumcision not in another Ordinance, but in Christ and his circumcision. You go on; *and whereas the Jewish teachers would be ready to object, that the receiving of the inward grace of circumcision, did not make them so compleat as* Abraham, *and his seed was, because they also had an outward sensible signe whereby they might be further perswaded, comforted and confirmed.* This is but a conceit that either the *Jews* were ready thus to object, or the Apostle intended to answer such an objection. The intent of the Apostle is to declare in what way and manner, and by what means they became compleat in Christ, *to wit*, Baptisme and Faith, whereby they had communion with Christ, and so were compleat in him. But you say, "*To this he answers*, vers. 12. *that neither is this priviledge wanting* "*to* Christians *who have as excellent and expresse a Sacrament of it, being* "*buried with Christ in Baptisme*; *the effect whereof he there sets down,* "*and therefore they needed not circumcision as their false teachers insinua-* "*ted, thereby directly teaching that our Baptisme is in stead of their circum-* "*cision.* It is true, the Apostle teacheth them that they needed not circumcision, but not because they had Baptisme in lieu of it, but because all was in Christ now, who hath abolished all these rites, or *taken them away quite*, vers. 14. *as being but shadows of good things to come, and the body is of Christ*, vers. 17. in whom, and in that which befell him all was accomplished. And *Aretius* therefore in his *Comment* on *Colos.* 2. saith rightly in this; *non a rem ipsam vindicari sanctis sine externo symbolo; quod tamen indesinenter urgebant adversarii; sic* Rom. 2. 29. *&* Phil. 3. 3. *Atque hoc beneficium in Christo habemus: est igitur perfectum organum salutis*, note that the thing it self is asserted to the Saints without an outward symbole, which yet the adversaries incessantly urged: so *Rom.* 2. 29. and *Phil.* 3. 3. and this benefit we have in Christ, he is therefore a perfect organ of salvation; so that it is utterly against the Apostles scope and whole argument to say, that therefore they needed not circumcision, because they had another Ordinance in the room of it. For the Apostles intent is plain, to shew, that Christ is in stead of Circumcision, and all the rest of the Jewish ceremonies. and the truth is by this doctrine, that Baptisme is in stead of Circumcision, the Apostles argument for the disanulling the Jewish ceremonies, both here, and *Hebr.* 9. & 10. 1. & 13. in the Epistle to the *Galatians*, chap. 3. & 4. and *Ephes.* 2. is quite evacuated, who still useth this argument to prove the abolition of the ceremonies of the Law, because they have their complement in Christ,

not

not in some new Ordinance added in stead of them; for if there be need of other Ordinances (besides Christ) in stead of the old, then Christ hath not in himself fulnesse enough to supply the want of them, and this abolition is not because of Christs fulnesse, but other Ordinances that come in stead of the abolished. And indeed, Baptisme and the Lords Supper, though they be Ordinances of Christ that may imitate or resemble the Ordinances of the *Jews*, yet it cannot be said they succeed into the roome, place, or use of them: For Christ only, and that which he did, doth so succeed: So that if things be well weighed, this Text is against your Position, not for it, and so your Ordinance is turned against you. You go on; "*And* "*the Analogy lies between two sacramentall types of the same substance* "[regeneration] *to both* Jews *and* Gentiles. I deny not but that there is Analogy between Circumcision and Baptisme, and so there is between the Deluge and *Noahs* Ark, or deliverance from the Deluge and Baptisme, 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. they do resemble each other in some things. But we are not to conclude thence, that Baptisme succeeds into the roome, place, and use of *Noahs* Ark, or that therfore we are to baptize married persons only, because in *Noahs* Ark only married persons were saved: For in the administration of an Ordinance, we are not to be ruled by bare Analogy, either framed by us, or delivered by the Spirit of God, but the institution of God. But the truth is, in this place, *Col.* 2. 11, 12. the Apostle rather resembles buriall to circumcision, then baptisme, and so makes the Analogy not between Circumcision and Baptisme, but circumcision and Christs buriall. And so *Chrysostome* on the place, and after him *Theophylact*, καὶ ὃ περιτομὴν καλεῖ πάλιν τάφον καλεῖ, *and what he calls circumcision, he again calls buriall.* You proceed thus: "*And in truth, had not baptisme come in* "*the roome of it, the Apostle could not have pitched upon a worse instance* "*then Circumcision, which was so much valued by them, and was so great* "*and usefull a priviledge to them.* It is true, circumcision was a great and usefull priviledge to them, in that estate they were before Christs incarnation, in comparison of *Heathens*, who had not a *School-master to bring them to Christ*, yet absolutely it was *a burthen and heavie yoak*, Acts 15. 10. 28. and it would be a burthen, not a priviledge, for us to have an Ordinance in the roome, place, and use of it, now Christ is come, *in whom we are compleat.* And it is true, the Apostle pitched on circumcision, *vers.* 11. because the *Jews* much valued it, but not to shew, as you say, that *Baptisme is in the roome,*

place, and uſe of it, but to ſhew, *that in Chriſt we have circumciſion, and are compleat in him.* You cloſe up this concluſion thus: "*Nor "had there been any reaſon to have here named Baptiſme, but that he meant "to ſhew Baptiſme to Chriſtians was now in the roome of circumciſion to "the* Jewes.

This is ſaid with more confidence, then truth: For another reaſon is plain from the context; that therefore Baptiſme is named, becauſe it is one of the means by which Chriſtians come to have communion with Chriſt, and to be compleat in him, which was the thing the Apoſtle intended in the 12th verſe, and therefore he joynes faith with Baptiſme, they being the two ſpeciall means whereby we come to have communion with Chriſt, and to be compleat in him. And this is further confirmed by comparing this with other Scriptures: *Gal.* 3. 25, 26, 27. the Apoſtle ſpeaks thus: *But after faith is come, we are no longer under a Schoolmaſter,* meaning *Circumciſion,* &c. *For we are all the children of God by faith in Chriſt Jeſus: For as many of you as have been baptized into Chriſt, have put on Chriſt*; which Text is apparently anſwerable to *Col.* 2. 8, 9, 10, 11, 12. And again, *Rom.* 6. 3, 4, 5. *Know you not that ſo many of us as were baptized into Jeſus Chriſt, were baptized into his death? therefore are we buried with him,* διὰ τῦ βαπτίσματος, *by baptiſme into death, that like as Chriſt was raiſed up from the dead, by the glory of the Father, even ſo we alſo ſhould walk in newneſſe of life: For if we have been planted together in the likeneſſe of his death, we ſhall be alſo in the likeneſſe of his reſurrection.* In which places you may eaſily perceive, that by putting on Chriſt, we come to be exempted from the Schoolmaſter, that is, the Law, and ſo from Circumciſion; that being planted into Chriſt, we walk in newneſſe of life, that is, as *Rom.* 7. 6. that *now we are delivered from the Law, that being dead wherein we were held, that we ſhould ſerve in newneſſe of ſpirit, and not in the oldneſſe of the letter*; and that the means hereof, is by Baptiſme by which we put on Chriſt, and are baptized into his death, and by faith, whereby we are no longer children under age, but ſons come to their inheritance. Thus have I at laſt, waded through your third Concluſion, and the Text, *Col.* 2. 11, 12. the miſunderſtanding of which hath been the *ignis fatuus*, fooliſh fire, which hath led men out of the way in this matter into bogs.

Your

§. 10. Of the notion under which, & the reasons for which persons were circumcised, shewing that all persons that were circumcised were not in the covenant of Grace.

YOur fourth Conclusion followes; "*That by Gods own expresse order, Infants as well as grown men were in the time of the* Jews *to be initiated and sealed with the signe of Circumcision, whether* Jews *by nature, or* Proselytes *of the* Gentiles, *one Law was for them all; if they receive the Covenant, they and their children were circumcised.*

It is true, this was Gods expresse order, and it is as certain that this expresse order of God is now revoked, or repealed, *Acts* 15. 10. 20. 26. *Gal.* 5. 1, 2, 3. as belonging to that administration, which was before Christ came. That which you adde *of the females virtuall circumcision in the males*, hath been examined before. I passe on to that which followes: "*And whereas some, who see which way the strength of this Conclusion tendeth, do alledge, that though Circumcision was to be applyed to their Infants, yet it was not as a seal of the spirituall part of the Covenant of Grace, but as a nationall badge, a seal of some temporall and earthly blessings and priviledges, as of their right to the Land of Canaan,* &c. *And that* Ishmael, *though he was circumcised for some temporall respects, yet he was not thereby brought under the Covenant of Grace, which was expresly said to be made with* Abraham, *in relation to* Isaac *and his seed.*

They that thus object, speak that which is truth, only whereas you make the objectors say, *That it was not a seal of the spirituall part of the covenant of Grace*, I would say, *to all that were circumcised*; and when you say, *but as a nationall badge*, &c. *that* Ishmael *was circumcised for some temporall respects*, I would leave out those words, and say, *because God commanded it.* Thus did I expresse my self in my *Latin* paper, affirming, *that not right to Euangelicall promises*, I now adde, *nor right to any other benefit by the Covenant made with* Abraham, *was the proper and adequate reason, why these, or those were circumcised, but Gods Precept: For as much as persons were to be circumcised, who had no right, either to the Euangelicall promises, or any other in that Covenant which was confirmed by circumcision; and I named* Ishmael, *concerning whom, though God heard* Abraham *in giving him some blessing upon* Abrahams *prayer, when he understood the promise was not intended for* Ishmael, *but to* Isaac, Gen. 17. 19, 20. *yet he expresly added his determination to hold*, vers. 21. *that he would establish his Covenant with* Isaac, *not with* Ishmael: *and on the other side, all the females in the Covenant were uncircumcised, though some of them had right to all the promises in the Covenant; and the Text expresly makes the reason of what* Abraham *did to be Gods appointment,*

ment, v. 23. *and no other*. Wherefore those that say, that Circumcision did not seal the spirituall part of the Covenant of Grace to all, and that *Ishmael* was not by circumcision brought under the Covenant of Grace, say no more, then what the Apostle saith, *Rom.* 9. 6, 7, 8. *Gal.* 4. 28, 29. and your self, *pag.* 13. where you say, *only true believers are made partakers of the spirituall part of the Covenant.* Now the end of this objection, is to prove that it followes not, because a person was appointed to be circumcised, therefore he was within the Covenant of Grace, or that because persons were within the Covenant of Grace, therefore they were to be circumcised. Let us now see what you answer to this. You say, "*I answer there is nothing plainer, then* "*that the Covenant, whereof Circumcision was a signe, was the Covenant* "*of Grace.*

It is granted, that the Covenant made with *Abraham*, *Gen.* 17. was the Covenant of Grace, though not a pure Covenant, but a mixt covenant. But what then? Doth it follow, that every one that was circumcised, was in the Covenant of Grace? It is true, the sacrifices did confirm the Covenant in Christs blood; but it doth not follow, that all that did offer sacrifices were partakers of the Covenant. The like may be said of Baptisme, the Lords Supper, Manna, *&c.* which they that did partake of, yet were not all of them in the Covenant, as the Apostle shews, 1 *Cor.* 10. 5. *Heb.* 3. 18, 19. It is one thing to be under the outward administration, another thing to be in the covenant of Grace. This is proper only to elect persons, the other is common to Elect and Reprobate, and depends meerly on Gods appointment without any other consideration. "You go on, *Abraham* "*received circumcision, a signe of the righteousnesse of Faith:* Very true, and the Apostle expoundeth this, when he saith, *which he had, yet being uncircumcised, that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised, that righteousnesse might be imputed to them also*, Rom. 4. 11. So that the Apostle makes *Circumcision a seal of righteousnesse*, but not to all, or only circumcised persons, but *to all believers*, whether *Jews* or *Gentiles*; so that according to the Apostles doctrine, *Circumcision*, in as much as it sealed to *Abraham* the righteousnesse of faith, which he had, being yet uncircumcised, is a seal to the *Gentiles* that believe of the righteousnesse of faith, though they be never circumcised. So that it is so far from being true, that persons have the promise, therefore they must have the seal in their persons; that it followes, persons have the promise, therefore they have

have the seal in *Abraham*, though they never are, nor may be sealed in their own persons. You go on, "*and the* Jewes *received it not as* "*a Nation, but as a Church, as a people separated from the world, and* "*taken into covenant with God.* If you take [*as*] with reduplication, it is true, *that neither the* Jewes *received circumcision as a Nation*, for then every nation should receive it, *nor as a Church or people separated from the world, and taken into covenant with God*; for then every Church or people separated from the world, and taken into covenant with God should receive circumcision, which is false, but they received it as appointed them from God, under this formall reason, and no other. But what is all this to the answering the objection, *That it was not the seal of the spirituall part of the Covenant of Grace to all circumcised persons, and that circumcision was appointed to persons not under the Covenant of Grace, and that the reason why persons were circumcised, was not because they were under the covenant of Grace, but only Gods appointment?* But you yet adde, "*It is true indeed that circumcision* "*bound them who received it to conform to that manner of administration* "*of the covenant which was carried much by a way of temporall blessings* "*and punishments, they being types of spirituall things.* It is right which you grant, that *circumcision bound them who received it to conform to that manner of administration of the covenant*, but then it is to be considered, that circumcision was a part of this administration; and that though temporall blessings, as of the land of *Canaan*, and rest in it, were shadows of the rest of Gods people, and so in a sort of administrations of the covenant of Grace, yet they were also part of the things promised in the covenant made to *Abraham*; and when you say, *circumcision bound them who received it, to conform to that manner of administration of the covenant which was carried much by a way of temporall blessings and punishments*; it is hard to shew in what sense they were bound to conform to temporall blessings and punishments: they were bound to conform to the sacrifices and offerings, and washings, *&c.* For these were their acts to be done by them, but how they were bound to conform to the administration by temporall blessings and punishments, it is hard to understand, sith they were Gods acts, not theirs. You adde, "*but no man can ever shew, that any were to receive* "*the Sacrament of Circumcision, in relation to those outward things only,* "*or to them at all, further then they were administrations of the Covenant* "*of Grace.* The truth is, no man was to receive the Sacrament of Circumcision in relation to these outward things only, or to them at all,

either

either as they were temporall bleſſings or types of ſpirituall things, and ſo, as you ſpeak, *adminiſtrations of the covenant of Grace*, but in this reſpect only, and for this reaſon, and no other, *becauſe God had ſo commanded*; though I deny not circumciſed perſons were by faith to look on the covenant of Grace through theſe adminiſtrations, yet the reaſon of being circumciſed was barely Gods command; ſo that if you abſtract *Gods command*, notwithſtanding the covenant, or any other adminiſtration of it, they were not to be circumciſed: You go on: "*Sure I am, the proſelytes and their children could not be circumciſed in any* "*relation at all to the temporall bleſſings of the land of* Canaan, *as they* "*were temporall, becauſe notwithſtanding their circumciſion, they were not* "*capable of receiving or purchaſing any inheritance at all in the land, ſo-* "*journe they might as other ſtrangers alſo did, but the inheritance of* "*the land, no not one foot of it could ever be alienated from the ſeverall* "*Tribes to whom it was diſtributed, as their Poſſeſſion by the moſt High:* "*For all the land was divided into twelve Tribes, and they were not any one* "*of them allowed to ſell their lands, longer then till the yeer of Jubilee,* "Lev. 25. *v.* 3. *&c.* *Yea, I may boldly ſay, that their circumciſion was ſo* "*far from ſealing to them the outward good things of the land, that it* "*occaſioned and tyed them to a greater expence of their temporall bleſſings,* "*by their long and frequent and chargeable journyes to worſhip at* Jeruſa-"lem: This which you ſay may be granted, and the thing which you would prove by it, *That they which received circumciſion, did not receive it in relation only to theſe outward things*, yet this overthrows not this Propoſition, *That the covenant made with* Abraham *had promiſes of temporall bleſſings, and that ſome were to be circumciſed, who had no part in the covenant of Grace.* You adde: "*And as for what was alledged con-* "*cerning* Iſhmael, *the Anſwer is eaſie; God indeed there declares, that* "Iſaac *ſhould be the Type of Chriſt, and that the covenant of Grace ſhould* "*be eſtabliſhed, and continue in his family, yet both* Iſhmael *and the reſt of* "Abrahams *family were really taken into covenant untill afterwards by* "*apoſtaſie they diſcovenanted themſelves, as alſo did* Eſau *afterwards,* "*though he were the ſon of* Iſaac, *in whoſe family God had promiſed the* "*covenant ſhould continue.* When you ſay, *that* Iſhmael *was really taken into the covenant*, meaning, *of Grace*, mentioned in a few words before, you oppoſe both the Apoſtle, *Rom.* 9. 7, 8. *Gal.* 4. 28, 29. as I have ſhewed before, and Gods own ſpeech, *Gen.* 17. 19, 20. To which I may adde, that *Iſaac* and *Jacob* only are ſaid to be *coheirs with* Abraham *of the ſame promiſe*, Heb. 11. 9. And when you ſay, *that he and* Eſau

were

were discovenanted by apostasie: you plainly deliver *apostasie from the covenant of Grace*, which I will not call in you *Arminianisme*, but in others it would, and that justly be so censured. But you will say, you *mean that* Ishmael *and* Esau *were* Abrahams *seed by profession, and outward cleaving to the covenant*, as you speak, *pag.* 14. But this is not *to be taken into the covenant of Grace really*, as you speak; for taking really into the covenant of Grace, is Gods act, either of election, or promise, or some act executing either of these; but profession and outward cleaving to the covenant is mans act; and therefore, how to salve your speech I know not. As for the objection, I see not that you have answered it, but that still it stands good, *that persons were to be circumcised, who were not in the covenant of Grace, that* Ishmael *was appointed to be circumcised, though it were declared Gods covenant did not belong to him; and therefore the reason of circumcising persons, was not the covenant of Grace, but only the will and command of God to have it so.* Your fifth Conclusion followes.

§. 11. Of the priviledges of Believers under the Gospel, and whether the want of Infant-Baptisme be want of a priviledge of the covenant of Grace which the *Jews* had.

cc "*Fifthly, and lastly, the priviledges of Believers under this last and best* cc *administration of the covenant of Grace, are many wayes inlarged,* cc *made more honourable and comfortable then ever they were in the time of* cc *the* Jews *administration.*

This Conclusion, with its Explication and Application, have all their vigour in ambiguity of speech, as the strength of the Coney is in its burrow; which, that I may uncover, I must distinctly declare, what is to be held in this matter, and then examine what you say. Priviledge is a Law term, the Etymologie is, *Privilegium quasi privæ lex, quia veteres priva dixerunt, quæ nos singula dicimus: Priviledge, as it were a private law, because the ancients called those things private, which we call singular*, Gel. noct. Attic. lib. 10. cap. 20. *Joh. Calvinus Wett.* in his Lexicon Juridicum voce privilegium. *Privilegium alii sic definiunt, jus singulare in certæ personæ gratiam favorenive, others so define a priviledge, a singular right in favour of a certain person*; so that a priviledge is a particular law, whereby some persons have benefit different from common right. *Calvin* ibid. *Item beneficium dicitur privilegium quia benè facit iis quibus conceditur contra legem communem, likewise a priviledge is called a benefit, because it benefits those to whom it is granted, against the common law.* If it do not benefit, it is not a priviledge; Priviledges therefore may be priviledges at one time, which are not at another time: and in comparison of some which are not

priviledges in compariſon of others. To have Chriſt perſonally preſent with the Diſciples, was a priviledge for the time, but it was a priviledge that he was abſent, when he went to heaven, and ſent his Spirit to them: The Lawes delivered to the *Jews* were priviledges in compariſon of the *Heathen*, but not in compariſon of *Chriſtians*. Priviledges of the covenant of Grace may be conceived, either in reſpect of the ſubſtance of the covenant of Grace, or the adminiſtration. Now, when you ſpeak of priviledges of the covenant of Grace, ſome paſſages ſeem to mean it in reſpect of the promiſes of grace in Chriſt, as when you ſay, *Our covenant is eſtabliſhed upon better promiſes, we as well as they are called a holy nation*, &c. *not only in the clearneſſe of the adminiſtration, but alſo*, &c. And thoſe eſpecially which you have when you ſay, *pag.* 31. *We are inquiring for priviledges, which are branches of the Covenant of Grace, which every man that is in covenant with God, may expect from God, by vertue of the Covenant*, which cannot be underſtood but of the promiſes. Now the promiſes of the covenant of Grace, are of the ſubſtance of the covenant, not of the adminiſtration: But other paſſages refer to the adminiſtration. *That yoak, that hard and coſtly way of adminiſtration, which neither they nor their fathers were able to bear, is taken off from our ſhoulders, the glory of theirs had no glory in reſpect of ours, they were under the bondage of Infants under age, in compariſon of our freedome*; which things belong to the adminiſtration, *pag.* 10. 12. Now, if you mean your concluſion of priviledges of the ſubſtance of the covenant of Grace, it is to be denied: For ſo the *priviledges of believers are not now inlarged many wayes, or made more honourable or comfortable.* Your ſelf, *pag.* 9. 10. 12. ſay, *they are the ſame to both* Jews *and* Gentiles: but in reſpect of the adminiſtration, *it is granted they are many wayes inlarged, made more honourable*; and in this ſenſe, I grant it; *that many Scriptures ſpeak of the inlargement of our priviledges, and particularly, thoſe that ſpeak of the removing the hard yoak*, Acts 15. 10. *and bringing us into liberty to full age*, Gal. 4. 1. *and greater glory*, 2 Cor. 3. 10. And it is true that thoſe things were priviledges to the *Iſraelites*, but it is a benefit to us, that we are freed from them, and ſo no priviledge for us, either to have them or any other thing in lieu of them, but Chriſt already come, who is in ſtead of all. Now the thing that you drive at, is this: that whereas you conceive that you have proved before, *that the Infants of thoſe that are in the covenant of Grace, are covenanters with their parents*; *that Baptiſme ſucceeds in the roome and uſe of their circumciſion, that by Gods*

expreſſe

expresse order, Infants were to be circumcised. You lastly conclude, *that our priviledges for our selves and children, are at least as honourable, large and comfortable, as theirs, and therefore our Infants are to be baptized.* The answer to it is this: It is true, our priviledge is the same with theirs in respect of the substance of the covenant, but neither was that made to the *Jews* naturall posterity as such, nor is it made to ours. As for Circumcision, it was indeed a priviledge, but belonging to the manner of administration not to the substance of the covenant which is invariable, a priviledge to the *Jews* in comparison of the *Heathens*, but a burthen in comparison of us; and it is so far from being a priviledge to our children, that they should have either it or any other thing in the place and use of it, but Christ manifested in the flesh, that the truth is, it is a great priviledge to us and our children, that they have neither it, nor any other thing in the stead of it but Christ manifested in the flesh: And so parents loose nothing by denying Baptism to Infants in the place & use of circumcision; but it is indeed, if rightly considered, a benefit to them to want it, God not appointing it, nor making a promise of grace to be confirmed by it to the Infants of Believers. Having premised this, I shall examine the proofs of your conclusion, and see whether they make any thing against that which I have delivered. The thing you should prove, is one of these two: either that circumcision did belong to the substance of the covenant of Grace, or, that the want of Circumcision, or some Ordinance in the place and use of it, is a losse of priviledge of the covenant of Grace to us and our children. That which you alledge is this: "*Many Scriptures speak of the inlargement of their priviledges, not one for the diminishing or depressing or extenuating of them; that yoak, that hard and costly way of administration, which neither they nor their fathers were able to bear, is taken off from our shoulders.* True, and by this, you yeeld that it may be an inlargement of priviledge to have somewhat removed that was a priviledge formerly. The Scripture to which you allude, is that, *Acts* 15. 10. Now I pray you, what was this yoak, but circumcision, as your self declare, *pag.* 39. and all the legall ceremonies which were great priviledges to the *Jews*; but yet to us it is a priviledge that we are freed from them, and if it be a priviledge to be free from circumcision, it is a priviledge to be freed from any ordinance in the roome, place, and use of it. Lastly, in that Circumcision is taken off from our necks, it appears, that it belongs not to the covenant of Grace, which is invariable, and belongs to *Gentiles* as well as

to *Jewes*, according to your concluſion. The next Scripture you bring, is *Heb.* 8.6. "*where our covenant is ſaid to be eſtabliſhed upon* "*better promiſes*. If this Scripture ſerve to your purpoſe, then the covenant of Grace now hath better promiſes then the covenant of Grace the *Jews* had: but this I know you will deny, who hold that *the covenant of Grace is the ſame both to* Jews *and* Gentiles. But that you may ſee how confuſedly you thruſt things together in this place, I pray you conſider what covenant it is of which the Author to the *Hebrewes* ſpeaks there, that it had not ſo good promiſes; Is it not expreſly ſaid to be that *which God made, when he took the* Iſraelites *by the hand, to bring them out of the land of* Egypt, *which covenant they brake*, verſ. 9. Now, although Dr. *Criſp*, vol. 2. Serm. 2. calls *the covenant of* Aarons *Prieſtood a covenant of Grace, though of leſſe grace*; yet you ſay thus, *pag.* 10. *and four hundred and thirty yeers after the Law was added, with great terror upon* Mount Sinai, *not as a part of this covenant*; and after, *plainly in that giving of the Law there was ſomething of the covenant of works made with* Adam *in* Paradiſe, *&c.* So that you do grant there was a rehearſall of the covenant of works; though you do make it alſo to have ſomething of the adminiſtration of the covenant of Grace. The truth is, the Scripture plainly makes it the covenant of works, *Rom.* 10.5. *Gal.* 3.10. 12. *Gal.* 4.24. *Heb.* 12.18. though I deny not that which you ſay, *that it was intended as a preparative and means to fit them for Chriſt*, and therefore may not unfitly be called *fœdus ſubſerviens, a ſubſervient covenant*, as *Cameron* in his *Theſes de triplici fœdere*. But this being ſo, to what purpoſe do you tell us, that *our covenant is eſtabliſhed upon better promiſes*; as if the *Jewes* covenant were no better then that on *Mount Sinai*, or as if the compariſon concerning priviledges were between the covenant of Grace now, and the covenant of Works then; whereas the queſtion is, as you ſay, *page* 31. *which are branches of the covenant of Grace*, and a little after, *but were no part of the covenant of Grace, which God made to* Abraham *and his ſeed*. Now *the covenant of Grace is that made with* Abraham, *Gal.* 3.15, &c. as your ſelf alledge, *pag* 10. and you ſay there, *that covenant was for ſubſtance alwayes the ſame*, and the ſubſtance as you recite it, *is the promiſes and the condition*; ſo that out of your own words it is clear, that we have no better promiſes in the covenant of Grace now, then they had then, only the adminiſtration of the covenant of grace is now better then it was to them; then it was mixt with other particular promiſes, which becauſe they are not cõmon to al believers

lievers in the covenant of grace, therfore belong not to the covenant of Grace in Christ purely taken, such as the promise of deliverance from *Egypt*, setling in *Canaan*, &c. For though it is true, that *godlinesse hath the promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come*, yet the promise of the life that now is, is not a particular promise of possession of such or such a land to us or our seed, or the coming of Christ out of our posteritie, as it was then, but only a generall promise of Gods providing for his children with persecution, *Mark.* 10. 30. Then it was with expectation of Christ to come, now with assurance of Christ already come in the flesh, and accomplishing what was foretold of him; then Christ was shadowed in darke types, now wee see him unveiled in a plaine history. So that though it be true that the priviledges of believers are now many wayes inlarged in some respects, yet simply the Covenant of Grace is not inlarged in respect of the substance of it, the promises of Grace and the condition, they are still belonging to the Elect and believers, and to no other. The cc next Scripture you thus expres. *The glory of theirs had no glory in* cc *spect of ours*; for this you quote 2 *Cor.* 3. 10. But this passage is plainly meant of the Covenant at Mount *Sinai*, which is called *the letter*, *ver.* 6. *The ministration of death written and ingraven in stones so glorious, that the children of Israel could not stedfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance, which glory was to be done away*, ver. 7. *The ministration of condemnation*, ver. 9. Which I suppose you doe not understand of the Covenant of Grace, and therefore it is impertinently alcc ledged. Your next is, *they were under the bondage of Infants under* cc *age in comparison of our freedome.* For this you alledge, *Gal.* 4. 1. &c. But this is said of the administration in types and shadows and ceremonies, called *the rudiments of the world*, ver. 3. Concerning which it is confessed our priviledges are enlarged: but *they are not branches of the Covenant of Grace, which every man who is in Covenant with God may ex-* cc *pect from God by vertue of the Covenant.* You goe on, *We as well as they* cc *are called a holy Nation, a peculiar people, a chosen Generation, separated* cc *to him from all other people:* It is granted we believers are such a holy Nation, &c. doth it therefore follow, that *the priviledges of beleevers under this last and best administration of the Covenant of Grace are many wayes enlarged?* You allude to that place, 1 *Pet.* 2. 9. and Mr *Blake*, cc *pag.* 8. *urgeth this text to prove a birthright priviledge of Christians,* cc *equall to the Nations of the Jewes.* But it is answered, this passage is meant of the invisible Church, the living & lively members of Christ.

cc To

cc To which he ſaith. *The contrary to this in the Text is cleare. Firſt, by* cc *looking back to the words that there precede: It is meant of all thoſe who* cc *do not profeſſedly with the unbelieving Jewes reject Chriſt.* I have looked backe and finde no ſuch thing there. It is true, there is mention of ſome who did reject Chriſt, *ver.* 7, 8. But that when *Peter* ſayes, *yee are a choſen Generation, a royall Prieſthood, &c.* it ſhould be meant of any other then true believers, who alone can offer ſpirituall ſacrifice acceptable to God through Jeſus Chriſt, is an interpretation which I diſclaime, much more that it ſhould be meant *of all thoſe who do not profeſſedly with the unbelieving Jewes reject Jeſus Chriſt.* For then it may be ſaid, not onely of *Simon Magus*, and other hypocrites, but alſo of all the ſalvages in the world that never heard of Chriſt, that *they are a choſen Generation, a royall Prieſthood, an holy Nation, a peculiar people, that they ſhould ſhew forth the praiſe of him, who hath called them out of* cc *darkneſs into his marvailous light.* Mr *Blake* addes, *Which will yet more* cc *fully appeare by comparing the words of* St Paul, *Rom.* 9. 32, 33. I deſire Mr *Blake* to reviſe his Treatiſe, and to examine whether this and many other paſſages anſwer to Mr *Vines*, and others commendation of it. To me the Text he cites *Rom.* 9.32,33. compared with 1 *Pet.* 2. 9. doe as well agree to prove that 1 *Pet.* 2. 9. is meant *of all thoſe who doe not profeſſedly with the unbelieving Jewes reject Chriſt*, as a harp and a harrow doe conſort to make muſique. But perhaps wee may ſee cc more by looking forward. *Secondly*, ſaith Mr *Blake*, *by looking for-* cc *ward to that which followes in the character which the Apoſtle (before* cc *he ends his deſcription) addes: which in times paſt were not a people,* cc *but now are the people of God. A ſpeech taken from the Prophet to ſet forth* cc *the caſe of the Gentiles, as it is alſo by* St Paul *interpreted*, Rom. 9. 26. cc *but the Gentiles thus called, and of no people made a people, have all a* cc *Covenant-holineſs, and not alwayes inherent holineſs.* Sure the word *nation* and *people*, did ſo run in Mr *Blakes* mind, that he could thinke of nothing but a nationall Church like the *Jewes*; whereas if he had weighed the words, *ver.* 10. of *having obtained mercy*, and conſidered that both *Rom.* 9. 25. & 26. are meant of the ſame, of whom he ſaid *ver.* 23. that *they were the veſſels of mercy, which he had afore prepared unto glory*, he would have plainly perceived the people and nation to be meant of the inviſible Church of the Elect, and ſo nothing in that Text for *the holineſs of a believing Nation, as ſome ſpeake, communicating a priviledge of the ſeales to the infants of that Nation*: which how abſurd a conceit it is, may be ſhewed perhaps more fully in that which fol-

cc lowes.

"lowes. You *adde to whom as well as to them belongs the adoption, the Covenant, the promises.* You allude doubtlesse to *Rom.* 9. 4. but had you alledged the whole Text, *ver.* 3, 4, 5. you would then have seen that it speakes of peculiar priviledges of the *Jewes*, *to whom the adoption, Covenants*, that is, as *Beza* thinkes, *the tables of the Covenant, the promises of their multiplying, having the Messiah from them, &c.* were peculiar in the sense the Apostle there speakes: And so M^r *Rutherfurd* due right of *Presbyteries, Chap.* 4. *sect.* 5. *pag.* 192. *That they had prerogatives above us is cleare*, Rom. 3. 1, 2, 3. Rom. 9. 4. *and that in other respects far more excellent we have prerogatives above them it is as cleare*, 2 Cor. 3. 7, 8, 9. Mat. 13. 16, 17. So that even in respect of the Covenant made with *Abraham* it is plaine the *Jewes* had some priviledges above us, and therefore this place proves the contrary to your conclusion, and that the want of some priviledges they had, may be recompensed by some other priviledges we have: And therefore you may see how feeble a reason this is from the Jewish priviledge of infant-males circumcision to prove infant-Baptisme. But to follow you in your way. You "say, *we as well as they injoy him to be our Father, and with his deareſt* "*Sonne our Lord are made co-heires of the Kingdome of Glory.* All this is granted, but to what purpose it is produced I see not. You adde, "*we have all these things with advantage, not onely in the clearnesse of the* "*administration, but in some sense in greater extent to persons with us*; *there is neither male nor female.* This is true also, we have the substance of the Covenant of Grace, that is, justification, &c. with advantage not only in the clearnes of administration, but in some sense in greater extent to persons with us. For now not only the small Nation of the *Jewes*, but also of all Nations, believers are brought into the Covenant of Grace. But this proves not your conclusion, or any "of those things that may serve for your purpose. You adde. *And* "*there is neither male nor female.* Why you adde this I know not, except you mean to insinuate, that in the Jewish Church there was male and female, because Circumcision was onely of Males. But neither doth the Apostle, *Gal.* 3. 28. intimate, that wee are better than the *Jewes*, as if their females were not within the Covenant of Grace, nor will you say it. Now that which you were speaking of, was the substance of the Covenant of Grace, that *wee are made co-heires of the Kingdome of Glory*, &c. not of the administration of it, and so there was no more distinction of male and female with the *Jewes* then with us, nor more priviledges of ours then of the *Jewes* in this particular.

Thus

Thus have I examined all the proofes you bring for your fifth Conclusion, and thereby you may perceive how you have heaped together many places of Scripture, without any usefull order or distinction or pertinency to the thing in hand. You bring in next an objection thus; *Some indeed goe about to shew, that in some things the Jewes had greater priviledges then we have, as that Abraham had the priviledge to be called the Father of the Faithfull, that Christ should be borne of his flesh; Mary had the priviledge to be the Mother of Christ, and the whole Nation this priviledge, that God will call in their seed againe, after they had been cast off for unbeliefe many hundred yeares; which priviledges, say they, none of the Gentiles have or can have.*

It is true, that in answer to the argument from Circumcision, as it is popularly framed (which yet I perceive many that either are or should be scholars to examine things more scholastically, do or pretend to satisfie their consciences with) thus; *If the children of believers be not to be baptized, then we have less priviledge then the Jewes; then the Grace of God under the new Testament, is straitned more then in the old.* To this argument as being an argument of no weight, but onely among vulgar and non-syllogizing capacities, among other things I said thus in my Latin paper above mentioned, *Nec absurdum est dicere respectu aliquorum privilegiorum gratiam Dei contractiorem in novo Testamento, quàm in veteri*, v. gr. *Nulla familia habet privilegium quod Abrahami familiæ concessum est, ut ex ea nasceretur Christus, nullus vir præter Abrahamum pater fidelium, nulla fœmina præter unicam mater Christi*, &c. *Yet it is not absurd to say, that in respect of some priviledges the grace of God is more contracted in the new Testament, then in the old: For instance; no family hath now the priviledge that was granted to Abrahams family, that out of it Christ should be borne: no man besides Abraham is called the Father of the faithfull; no woman besides one, the mother of Christ.* By which I would shew, that it is no absurditie to grant that the *Jewes* may have more priviledges *secundum quid, in some things*, then wee, and yet our case and condition, to speak simply, better then theirs, by reason of other priviledges we have above them, which recompence the defect of those priviledges, whether real or supposed, which is the very same which as *Robinson* did alledge, so *Rutherford* grants in the place above-named, and cites two Scriptures to prove it, *Rom.* 3. 1, 2, 3. *Rom.* 9. 4. And the truth is, priviledges are so arbitrary and various, that God gives them as he thinkes good, oft times without assigning any special reason, so that no argument can be drawne thus.

God

God gave such a priviledge to the *Jewes*, *Ergo*, we must have such a priviledge too, except we can prove it is Gods will it should be so. And therefore this Argument is of no force, but rather an argument of arrogant presumption, without an institution to attempt to prove, that because the *Jewes* had a priviledge to circumcise infants, therefore we must have a priviledge to baptize infants, nor doe any of the many Scriptures you have alledged, prove that Baptisme of infants is a priviledge granted by God in lieu of Circumcision: But you take upon you to answer this objection. "*You say, but these things have no weight: we are inquiring for priviledges which are branches of the Covenant of Grace, which every man who is in Covenant with God, may expect from God by vertue of the Covenant, were he a Jew or a proselyte, not for any particular or peculiar favour to a particular man or woman, or family, or tribe: All these forementioned things, and many other of the like kind (as the ministery of the Tabernacle & Temple to belong to one Tribe, the Kingly office to one family, such and such men never to lacke a man of their house to stand before God) proceeded indeed from free grace, but were no parts of the Covenant of Grace, which God made to Abraham and all his seed. For could every man in Covenant challenge these things at Gods hand, and that by vertue of the Covenant? Could every one of them promise that Christ should be borne of his flesh? or every one of their women that shee should be the mother of Christ? Could every one whom God owned to be in Covenant with him, promise by vertue of the Covenant, that their Children, if cast off by unbeliefe, should after many hundred yeares be againe called in? We speak onely of such priviledges as were universall and common to all who were in Covenant, for which by vertue of the Covenant they might relie upon God.* Though you say, *the things objected have no weight*, yet it may seeme they are so heavy & presse your conclusion so hard, as that you cannot well ease it of them. The things objected, you deny not: but you answer, that they are impertinent: you tell us why, *because you enquire for priviledges which are branches of the Covenant of Grace, common to all in Covenant, which they may challenge at Gods hand by vertue of the Covenant*, and such are not these. It is not materiall what you inquire after, men may *sectari Aquilam in nubibus; follow after an Eagle in the Clouds*. But sure I am the Scriptures you bring, prove not *that believers now have more priviledges belonging to the Covenant of grace, which all may challenge at Gods hands, then the Jewes had*. Yea your second conclusion contradicts your fifth, understood in this sense. Beside, Circumcision was not a priviledge

common to all in the Covenant of Grace: For besides all the faithfull before *Abraham*, and those of his time, *Melchisedeck*, and *Lot*, and their households, and *Job* after his time, there was a sort of proselytes, called *strangers, or of the gate*, who were not circumcised, yet the Scripture reckons them among the worshippers of God. Such is *Cornelius* conceived to be by *Mede* in his discourse on *Acts* 17. 4. by *Selden lib. 2. de jure nat. & Gent. c.* 4. who is said to be εὐσεβὴς, a *godly* or *devout man, and one that feared God with all his house, which gave much almes to the people, and prayed to God alwayes*, Act. 10. 2. and therefore within the Covenant of Grace. Besides the priviledges alledged in the objection doe some of them at least belong to the Covenant of Grace as well as Circumcision, *as to be Father of the faithfull, to be the Mother of Christ*, and the last belongs much more to the Covenant of Grace then circumcision. And those *Rom.* 9. 4. are priviledges which you alledge as belonging to the Covenant of Grace, to which I may joyne that *Rom.* 3. 2. that *to them were committed the Oracles of God*, which yet were prerogatives of the *Jewes*, as M^r *Rutherford* rightly and according to truth. Lastly, the phrases, *Rom.* 11. 21. *of the naturall branches*, ver. 24. *of the wild Olive by nature, thou wast graffed in besides nature, these according to nature*, doe seeme to me to import, not that the *Jewes* were in the Covenant of Grace by nature, but that they had this priviledge to be reckoned in the outward administration, as branches of the olive by their birth, by vertue of Gods appointment which the Gentiles have not. But you goe on. "*Let any man "shew out of the Scripture, where our priviledges under the Gospel are cut "short in any of these things, and he saith somewhat, and in particular for "the case in hand, concerning our infants right to the Covenant of Grace, "and the seale of it: Once we are sure the infant children of all Covenan-"ters were within the Covenant, and the seale also belonged to them, and "by vertue of the Covenant (which is still the same) we plead their inte-"rest in it. Let any man shew when and where this was taken away, when "the infant children of believers were expunged out of the Covenant of "grace.* It is unreasonable to require men to shew what they doe not avouch; it were equall to exact this taske at the hands of those who doe expunge the infant children of believers out of the Covenant of Grace: we neither write in nor expunge out; but leave that to God onely, from whom we learne, *Esau have I hated, Jacob have I loved.* Though you thinke your selfe sure, that *all the infants of Covenanters were within the Covenant of Grace*, yet I see no cause to believe you,

for

for as much as I thinke God never shewed you the booke of life, that you may see who are written in, who expunged out of the Covenant of Grace, and S^t *Paul* who was as well read in that booke as you, saith *Rom. 9. 8. They which are the children of the flesh, are not the children of God, but the children of the promise are counted for the seed*, which how to spell I have shewed above. But you adde. "*Certainly who ever "will goe about to deprive them of it, to cut off such a great part of the com-"fort of believing parents, must produce cleare testimonies before they can "perswade believers to part with either of them, either right to the Cove-"nant, or to the seale of the Covenant.* And you adde two reasons of it. You are now on your advantage ground, in a veine of Oratory, and on a subject, of all others, apteſt to move affections, to wit, parents tendernesse to their children. But wee must not sacrifice truth to either of these. You insinuate that Antipædobaptists goe about to deprive infant-children of believers of the Covenant of Grace. They may tell you, it were a madnes for them to goe about such an impossibilitie, as the putting out or putting into the Covenant of grace, and that they hope so well of you, that you come not so neere the Papists, or *Augustines* opinion, as to thinke infants dying unbaptized, are out of the Covenant of Grace. And as for cutting off a great part of the comfort of believing parents, I pray you tell us what comfort is cut off by it, you cannot say that either an infant is certainly regenerated or saved by Baptisme, nor can you say, he is lost for want of it. What comfort then doe you give them indeed which the Antipædobaptists doe not give as well as you? Or, what discomfort in truth, do they give them, which you do not? All the comfort you can indeed give them, is that according to your *Hypothesis*, they do their duty: But if it be proved that they prophane the Ordinance of Baptisme by bringing Infants to baptisme (which there is great cause to think they do) it may rather bring discomfort to their conscience in fine, then comfort. But to Believers indeed, Gods glory will be more deare then their own comfort; and therefore they will be content to part with that which dishonoured God, though it seemed cause of complaint to themselves: they will imitate *Abraham*, who quieted himself in the will of God concerning *Ishmael*, though deare unto him; and *Isaac*, who perceiving Gods rejecting of *Esau*, yet submitted to his will. And for your two reasons, because they are only a piece of pathetick oratory, I passe over. For though there be some strains that Logically examined will not endure the test, yet

having learned the rule about reading the Fathers, not to account all their Rhetoricall expressions their Dogmaticall resolutions, I am willing to conceive the same of you. And as for your recapitulation of your conclusions, and your inference thereupon, how short they are of your conceit of them, I leave it to your self to consider, and proceed to that which you say is the main and only Objection remaining which hath any colour of weight in it.

§. 12. That the command to circumcise male Infants is not virtually a command to baptize Infants.

YOu say the Objection is this: "*There is no command, no expresse in-*"*stitution, or clear example in all the new Testament of baptizing of* "*Infants; and in the administratinn of Sacraments, we are not to be led* "*by our own reason, or grounds of seeming probabilitie, but by the expresse* "*order of Christ, and no otherwise.*

This you justly count the main objection; which if you could answer clearly, all the rest of your Discourse might be saved, and without answering it, all that you have said else is to little purpose. For, though it were proved that *the children of Believers were in the covenant of Grace, Baptisme succeeds to Circumcision, our priviledges greater then the* Jewes, yet all this cannot acquit the practice of baptizing Infants from will-worship, without an institution, by Precept or Apostolicall example. And therefore, as it concerns *Smectymnuus*, so almost all the Divines of the Assembly, and Preachers of the City, that have so often delivered in their Sermons at *Westminster*, now in print, and in the City, *that in Gods Worship we must not meddle a jot further then God hath commanded*, to shew some institution of Christ, or example of his Apostles for it, otherwise the Prelatists will tell you, that they can shew virtuall command from Analogie of the Ceremoniall Law of the *Jews*, and tradition Ecclesiasticall as ancient as yours for Pædobaptisme, for their Prelacy, Holydayes, Surplice, *&c.* against which there have been so many, and those just Declamations. If then you do not stand to it here you may yeeld up your weapons. Let us then try it out on this ground: You begin thus; "*If by* "*institution, command and example, they mean an expresse syllabicall com-*"*mand*, &c. *I grant that in so many words it is not found in the new* "*Testament that they should be baptized: No expresse example where* "*children were baptized.* Sure this is a shrewd signe that you are not likely to make good your ground, when you have yeelded so much. But I grant, that if you make it good, by good consequence, you may recover all. Let us then consider what you say of that.

that. "*But I also adde, that I deny the consequence, that if in so* "*many words it be not commanded in the new Testament, it ought not* "*to be done; this is not true Divinity, that Christians are not tyed to ob-* "*serve that which is not expresly in so many words set down in the new* "*Testament.* True, but whose consequence is this? Infants are not to be baptized, because that which is not in so many words commanded in the new Testament, ought not to be done? The consequence rightly framed is this: In meer positive worship that ought not to be done, which hath not Precept, or Apostolicall example equivalent to a Precept, gathered by plain words, or good inference out of the new Testament: For, if it have none of these, it is wil-worship. And Baptisme of Infants is such, therefore it ought not to be done. The ground of it is this, because all the ceremoniall or meere positive worship of the *Jewes* is now abrogated; and therefore a Precept of God to them is not a warrant to us now, if it were, it must be in one thing as well as another, and so we must bring on our necks the yoak of bondage of the *Mosaical* Law. Now let us see how you encounter this Argument: you answer by telling us; "*there* "*is no expresse reviving of the Lawes, concerning the forbidden degrees of* "*marriage in the new Testament, except of not having a mans fathers* "*wife,* 1 Cor. 5. 8. *No expresse Law against polygamie; no expresse com-* "*mand for the celebration of a weekely Sabbath; are therefore Christians* "*free in all these cases?* I answer, no, but withall I say, that the first instance is about a morall command, and yet there is for one branch of incest, an expresse censure in the new Testament, proving the unlawfulnesse of it; whereas the businesse is now about a point of meer positive ceremoniall worship, and so there's not the like reason. Secondly, the same may be said of Polygamie, that it is a sin against a morall Precept, and yet there is good proof against it in the new Testament, from *Mat.* 19. 5. 9. And for the third, enough hath been said above, *Part.* 1. *Sect.* 8. to shew how little advantage you have in this instance. But you adde, "*yea in the point of Sacraments* "*there is no expresse command, no example in all the new Testament, where* "*women received the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, there is no expresse* "*command, that the children of Believers, when they are grown, should be* "*instructed and baptized by their parents; expresse command there is, that* "*they should teach the Heathen, and the Jews, and make them Disciples,* "*and then baptize them, but no command that the children of those that* "*are Believers should be baptized when they are grown men; nor any ex-*

"*ample*

"*ample where ever that was done: will any man therefore say, that Chri-*
"*stian women are not to be partakers of the Lords Supper? I think none*
"*will be so absurd as to affirm it. If it be said, though these things be*
"*not expresly and in* terminis *in the new Testament, yet they are there vir-*
"*tually, and by undeniable consequence, I confesse it is true.* You do in this perioch, give two instances of practice, warranted by command, or example, gathered by consequence in the new Testament, in the positive worship of the Sacraments, to wit, *womens receiving the Lords Supper, and the baptizing of children of Believers, when grown persons, which you grant are virtually, and by undeniable consequence in the new Testament, though not expresly and in* terminis, *in terms.* Now this thing you need not have proved, I readily grant it, that what ever in positive worship is commanded in the new Testament, though it be not in formall terms commanded, yet if it may be gathered by virtuall consequence, ought to be done. Nevertheless, I observe: First, that you do well expresse the institution of Christ, *Matth.* 28. 19. when you say, *expresse command there is, that they should teach the Heathen and the Jews, and make them Disciples, and then baptize them,* of which I may make further use afterwards. Secondly, that when you say, *there is no expresse command, no example in all the new Testament, where women received the Sacrament of the Lords Supper,* you imply there is for males. Now, herein you, Mr. *Vines* and Mr. *Blake*, and generally others follow *Zwinglius*, whose conceit this was, if he were not the first inventor: And Mr. *Blake* expresseth himself thus, *pag.* 22. "*No*
"*particular president more then for this of Infant-baptisme.* But I pray you tell me, is not that, 1 *Cor.* 11. 28. Δοκιμαζέτω δὲ ἄνθρωπος, *Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup,* an expresse command in formall terms? And doth not ἄνθρωπος comprehend both Sexes? When the Apostle sayes, *vers.* 23. *I delivered unto you that which I received from the Lord,* was not that a command, and that to the whole Church, women as well as men? when he saith, 1 *Cor.* 18. 17. *We being many, are one bread, and one body; for we are all partakers of that one bread,* and are not women as well of the body as men? And if so, here is an expresse example in formall terms for womens receiving the Lords Supper? The like may be said, of 1 *Cor.* 12. 13. *Acts* 20. 7. unless you will say, that ἑαυτὸν πάντες, μαθηταὶ, himself, all, Disciples, comprehend not women, because they are of the Masculine Gender, which from you that have learned that *Logica non curat sexum, Logick regards not sex,* and that hundreds of

places

places there be, where the Masculine Gender is put, the matter so requiring it, for both Sexes, I do not suspect. And for your other instance, as I do not remember any brings it but your self, so it is as little to the purpose as the other: For that which you say, *that there is no expresse command that the children of Believers should be baptized when they are grown men.* It is true, except they professe the faith; but there is an expresse command, as your self grant, to baptize Disciples, and so to baptize the childe of a Believer that professeth the faith, not otherwise; so that these your instances are brought to prove that which is not denied, and yet the instances are impertinent to prove it. You say further: "*So have we virtually, and by undeniable consequence, sufficient evidence for the baptizing of children, both commands and examples.* This assertion is full, if you mean by children, Infant-children of Believers, prove this, and you need prove no more. But your fetching such a compasse about, makes me imagine your attempt will prove but a *Parturiunt montes, the mountains bring forth*, especially, when your proof is but from Analogy; concerning which, the rule holds, as Mr. *Bowles* in his Sermon on *Joh.* 2. 17. *Allegorica Theologia*, (unlesse the Lord himself make the application) *non est argumentativa, Allegoricall Divinity is not argumentative*; but it is fit you should be heard. You say, "*For, first you have Gods command to* Abraham, *as he was the father of all covenanters, that he should seal his children with the seal of the covenant.* I grant we have Gods command to *Abraham*, who is indeed called, the Father of the faithfull, no where that I know, the father of all covenanters, to circumcise his males of eight dayes old; and I deny not, but that this was a seal, *that is*, a confirming signe of the covenant God made with *Abraham*; whence *Gods covenant was said to be in their flesh*, *Gen.* 17. 13. and 'tis called *the covenant of circumcision*, *Act.* 7. 8. But you have need of the Philosophers stone to turn this into a command to baptize Infants of Believers, which you thus attempt. You tell us, "*Now this truth, all our Divines defend against the* Papists, *that all Gods commands and institutions about the Sacraments of the* Jews, *binde us as much as they did them in all things which belong to the substance of the Covenant, and were not accidentall unto them.* This is your foundation for your undeniable consequence, it had need then be very undeniable, and so you conceive it, *because it is a truth all our Divines defend against the* Papists. But this is no undeniable Axiome, *that what all the* Protestant *Divines defend against the* Papists *must be truth*

truth undeniable, I do not think all the Divines in the Assembly will subscribe to it; I for my part do disclaim it, I give that honour only to the Holy Scripture, and have learned from *Art.* 21. of the Church of *England*, *that Generall Councels have erred, and may erre*, and consequently all the Divines in the world: And one *Paphnutius* is to be heard against a whole Oecumenicall Councel sometimes. And for this which you call *a truth*, *all our Divines defend against the* Papists, I marvell how you can averre it, unlesse you had read them all, which I think neither you nor any one else hath; and for this Maxime, I question whether any one leading Author have delivered that which you charge all our Divines with, because you direct not where they deliver it, it is in vain for me to make search; it were to seek a needle in a bottle of hay; but I will examine whether it be truth or no. You suppose, *that there are commands of God about the Sacraments of the* Jews, which is granted: But then let me tell you, I do not assent to this, that Circumcision and the Passeover are all the ordinary Sacraments of the *Jews*; I do approve of the words of *R. C.* that is, as I learn from Mr. *Selden*, *de anno civili veter. Judæ. c.* 2. Mr. *Ralph Cudworth* of *Cambridge*, (whom he there commends) in that book of his, which is of the true notion of the Lords Supper, *chap.* 2. styl'd by Mr. *Selden*, *A witty and very learned book*, where he saith, *I know not what warrant there is for that divinity so magisterially imposed upon us by some, that the* Jews *had but two Sacraments, Circumcision, and the Passeover, and that it should thence follow by inevitable consequence, that the Lords Supper must ἀντιτυπεῖν, answer only to the* Jewish *Passeover*; *sure I am, the* Jews *had many more*; *for not to instance in that of* Paul, 1 *Cor.* 10. 2, 3, 4. *nor to examine all the other Sacramentall ceremonies which they had, that were almost as many Sacraments as Ceremonies, these feasts upon the sacrifices which we have all this while insisted on, were nothing else but true and proper Sacraments joyned with sacrifices.* I adde, that according to the received definitions of a sacrament, all the sacrifices that were propitiatory, were Sacraments, that is, *visible sealing signes of invisible grace in Christ appointed by God to that end.* Secondly, you suppose, "*that of those commands and institutions of God,* "*some did belong to the substance of the covenant, some were accidentall to* "*them.* This last expression is very ambiguous, whether you mean by [*them*] the *Jewes*, or the Sacraments, which seems most likely; or, whether you would, as the law of opposion requires, say *accidentall to the Covenant.* Again, you here contradistinguish *the substance of the*

Covenant

covenant, and that which is accidentall to it, which I construe in the same sense that you distinguish between *the substance of the covenant and the administration of it*, pag. 10. Conceiving by your explication that you call the substance of the Covenant that which is invariable, and that which is accidentall that which is variable. Substance doth not agree to Covenant, which is an action in proper sense; but in Schooles it is usuall to distinguish between the substance of the act, and the circumstances of it, the essence and the accidents, but I do not remember that Logicians do oppose the accidents of an act to the substance of it, and so your expression *of the substance of the covenant, and that which is accidentall*, is not in my apprehension, after the usuall speech of the Schooles, and therefore I cannot well tell what sense to make of it. If [*them*] referre to the *Jewes*, then it is said, *something of the Sacraments was accidentall to the* Jewes, but I know not how to make any handsome sense of this. If you referre [*them*] to the Sacraments, you make something commanded by God, accidentall to the Sacraments, which may be yeelded you in this sense; that there might something have the essence of a Sacrament without such accidents, as it might be true Circumcision, though it were not the eighth day; it might be a true Passeover, though not on the right night. Yet, in this sense it cannot be yeelded that it was so accidentall, that it might be omitted without sin, any more then the thing it self: For, it was as well a sin, not to circumcise the eighth day, or not to keep the Passeover on the night appointed by God, as not to do these acts at all, since a command was broken in one as well as the other: For these reasons, I cannot well tell how to deny or grant that which you suppose, *that some commands of God about the Sacraments of the* Jews, *were accidentall to them.* But that which is supposed, "*that some of the commands of God about the Sacraments of the* "Jews, *did contain things belonging to the substance of the Covenant*, meaning, of the covenant of Grace, I can in no wise assent unto it: For, if either you mean by substance the essence of the covenant, I utterly deny that any of the Sacraments of the *Jews* were of the essence of the covenant, Gods Covenant was, and might be without them: If you mean by substance, that which in no case might be varied, I deny it in that sense also; Nothing of the sacraments of the *Jews* was morall and invariable. And it is most true, that as the sacrifices, so Sacraments (according to the common distinction) were belonging to the administration of the covenant for the time, but never

of the substance of the covenant; for that consists only in the things you expresse for the substance, *pag.* 10. And for the maxime which you father on all our Divines, which I can hardly believe any one of our Divines have delivered, as you have done, I utterly deny it, to wit, "*that all Gods commands and institutions about the Sacraments of* "*the* Jews *bind us as much as they did them, in all things which belong to* "*the substance of the Covenant*, as being contradictory to those words, *Art.* 7. of the Church of *England*. *Although the Law given from God by* Moses, *as touching Ceremonies and Rites, do not bind Christian men*, and on the contrary, I affirm, *that they are all abrogated, substance and circumstance, whole, and part*; and I thus prove it: First, those things bind us not which had their complement in Christ, but all the Sacraments of the *Jews* had their complement in Chtist, *Ergo*. The *Major* is the force of the Apostles prohibition; and the reason of it, *Col.* 2. 16, 17. the *Minor* is delivered, 1 *Cor.* 5. 7. *Col.* 2. 17. *Heb.* 9. 9. *Heb.* 10. 1. And *Beza* in Annot. in *Col.* 2. 14. *Hoc respectu ut Euangelicæ gratiæ adhuc exhibendæ, σφραγῖσι, ceremoniis finis erat impositus ipsius Christi, id est veritatis, quam antea adumbrarant exhibitione, by the exhibition of Christ himself, that is the truth, which before they shadowed, there was an end put to ceremonies in this respect, as being seals of Euangelicall grace yet to be exhibited.* Secondly, those things bind not us now, which were taken away by Christs death; this I suppose you will not deny, lest you evacuate the effect of Christs death: But Christ hath by his death abolished all the sacraments of the *Jews*, comprehended under the law of commands in ordinances or rites, *Ephes.* 2. 15. *Col.* 2. 14. therefore they bind not. Thirdly, those commands which were only to continue till faith came, those bind not now faith is come: But the commands of the Sacraments of the *Jews* were such, therefore they bind not now: The *Major* and *Minor* are delivered, *Gal.* 3. 23, 24, 25. *Gal.* 4. 1, 2, 3, 4. *Act.* 15. 9, 10. Fourthly, those commands bind us not, which were a partition wall between *Jews* and *Gentiles*; but all the Sacraments of the *Jews* in whole and in part, were a partition wall between *Jews* and *Gentiles*, therefore they bind us not. The *Major* and *Minor* are delivered, *Ephes.* 2. 14. Fifthly, those commands which were unprofitable, and weak rudiments of the world, contrary to Christ, beggerly rudiments, these bind not a Christian now; but such are the *Jews* sacraments, *Heb.* 7. 18. *Col.* 2. 8. 20. *Gal.* 4. 3. 9. therefore they bind not. Sixthly, those commands that belonged to another Priesthood

then

then Christs, bind not Christians, but the *Jews* sacraments belonged to another Priesthood then Christs, therefore they bind not. The *Major* and *Minor* are both delivered, *Heb.* 7. 12. 16. *Heb.* 9. 10. Seventhly, those commands that belonged to another covenant then that which now in force, bind not; but such are the commands of the *Jews* sacraments, *Heb.* 8. 13. *Heb.* 9. 1. therefore they bind not. Eightly, those commands which were proper to the *Jews*, bind not us Christians; but the sacraments of the *Jews* were proper to the *Jews*, so was Circumcision, the Passeover, the Sacrifices; therefore they bind us not. Ninthly, If one part bind us, then all the commands bind us; and if we be obliged to any one rite, then to all, for they had all the same authority; nor hath that authority dissolved any one part more then another. Now it is a sure rule, that *ubi lex non distinguit, non est distinguendum*, *where the law distinguisheth not, we must not distinguish*; therefore, either none binds us, or else we must revoke *Judaisme*. And indeed, to say, so far a command of God binds, and so far not, without a plain declaration of Gods will, is an high presumption, whereby man takes on him to release or dispense with Gods Law, which is of equall authority with the making of a law. Lastly, those commands bind us not, which the Apostle would not have us subject to, no not in part, but such are the commands of the Jewish sacraments, *Col.* 2. 16. 20. *Gal.* 5. 1, 2, 3. and your self say, *pag.* 27. *the Apostle would take them off wholly from circumcision*; therefore they bind us not: Yea, it is to overthrow utterly our Christian liberty by Christ, which the Apostle was so stiffe in maintaining that *he would not yeeld, no, not one hour*, and blamed *Peter* for dissembling this liberty, *Gal.* 2. 5. 14. to maintain that "*all* "*the commands and institutions of God about the Sacraments of the* Jews "*bind us as much as they did them in all things which belong to the sub-*"*stance of the Covenant, and were not accidentall to them.* But you endeavour to make good your Maxime by instances, and accordingly you say thus: "*As because Circumcision is called a seal of the covenant,* "*therefore our Sacraments are seals of the covenant*; though circumcision no where that I know, be called the seal of the covenant, but only *the seal of the righteousnesse of faith*, Rom. 4. 11. yet, because it is called *a signe or token of the Covenant*, Gen. 17. 11. it may well be called a seal or confirming signe of the covenant with *Abraham*, and so of the covenant of Grace; and our Sacraments may be so called likewise, they being confirming signs of the new Testament, *Luk.* 22. 10.

Acts 2. 38. but not because Circumcision was called so, but because that phrase expresseth the truth of the thing. But what is this instance to your purpose? Is there a command or institution of God, binding the *Jews* to call Circumcision so? or a command or institution for us by vertue of the command to the *Jews* to call it so? though I should oppose him that should deny our Sacraments to be seals of the covenant, because he should deny a truth, yet I should not say he did sin that did not call them so. Your next instance is, "*because Circumcision might be administred but once, being the seal of initiation, therefore Baptisme being also the seal of initiation is to be administred but once.* However I conceive no necessity of circumcision or Baptisme above once, yet I professe my self unsatisfied in this, that there is either a command, that a person be but once circumcised, or a person once only baptized: However, if there were a command that a person should be but once circumcised, and it could be proved that a person should be but once baptized, yet I utterly deny, that the command to circumcumcise but once, is a cammand to baptize but once; and therefore what ever any Divines may dictate Magisterially, yet I do not think my self in *Pythagoras* his School, that αὐτὸς ἔφα, *he said it*, should be my rule. You adde: "*but that circumcision was to be administred on the eighth day only, was an accidentall thing, and therefore bindeth not.* I see no reason why once circumcising should belong to the substance of the covenant, and to be circumcised on the eighth day should be accidentall; yea, if reason may rule the roast, there is more reason that circumcising on the eighth day should belong to the substance of the covenant, being commanded by God expresly, and as many of the Ancients conceive, particularly *Cyprian, Ep. 99. ad finem*, typifying Christs resurrrection on the eighth day, then that to be circumcised but once, should be of the substance of the covenant, which is neither commanded, nor is found in Scripture to typifie any thing belonging to the Covenant: So vaine are mens conceits, without the light of the Word.

But you go forward in the other Sacrament. "*The Jewish Passeover being to be yearly repeated, binds us to have a repetition of the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, which came in roome of it, because this belongs to the substance of the Covenant; both of them being Sacraments for spirituall nourishment, growth, and continuance in the Covenant: (as the other was, for birth and entrance) but that their Passeover was to be eaten in an evening, and upon one set evening in the yeare, was accidentall,*

"*tall, and so binds not us.* Here is a heape of dictats without proofe. I grant the Jewish Passeover was to be yearly repeated, because God so commanded it, but that either this belonged to the substance of the Covenant, or that this command binds us to the frequent use of the Lords Supper, I deny it: if it did, it were a very good plea for the superstitious custome of keeping Easter, and receiving the Communion once a yeare on that day, which I thinke you will be ashamed of, though you lay the egge out of which it may be hatched. I grant the Lords Supper is to be repeated often, not because *the Jewish Passeover was to be yearly repeated, or because it is the Sacrament for spirituall nourishment, growth, and continuance in the Covenant (as the other was for birth and entrance)* but because it may be plainly gathered from the Institution or Command of Christ, and the Apostles declaration thereupon, 1 *Cor.* 11. 25, 26. for ὁσάκις doth imply πολλάκις, *as oft* doth imply, not obscurely but plainly, *a frequency*, and if example must be a rule, as it is conceived in many cases lesse cleare, and that have lesse reason; that example *Acts* 20. 7. should binde that on the first day of the weeke, when Disciples come together they have the Lords Supper, for the which the meeting then was intended, and that action gave denomination to the whole service; and by the relation of *Justine Martyr* (if my memory deceive me not) and others, it was so in the primitive Church of Christians; but I desire to be sparing in matters of command on mens consciences. As for that "*you make the Evening accidentall to the Passeover, and so not binding us* "*in the use of the Lords Supper*, it's but a dictate. The Evening of the Passeover is no more accidentall then the day it selfe, they being commanded both together. And for the Lords Supper, how we can be loose to receive it in the Morning or Evening after Supper, when the Apostle doth so distinctly mention in this relation of the Institution, 1 *Cor.* 11. 23. that it was done in the night; and vers. 25. μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι, *after he had supped*; I leave to your Assembly to consider; Especially those of you that are so stiffe for the sitting together at the Table, which is not mentioned or hinted in the Apostles relation, and therefore may seeme as much occasionall as the other. And for that which you intimate, "*as if Baptisme were not the Sacrament for spi-* "*rituall nourishment, growth, and continuance in the Covenant, as well* "*as for entrance*; I take to be but a dictate like the rest, which upon exact examination will not hold: it seems to me somewhat neare of kinne to that of *Bellarmine* and other Papists, that the efficacy of Baptisme

tisme extends not to the remission of the sinnes of our whole life, but of originall sinne onely.

But you have yet one more Instance, and thus you speake; "*The like Instance I give in our Christian Sabbath; the fourth Commande-ment binds, as for the substance of it, as much as ever it bound the Jewes, there God once for all, separated one day of seven to be sacred to himselfe, and all the world stood bound in all ages to give unto God that one day of seven, which should be of his own choosing. Now untill Christs time, God chose the last day of the seven to be his Sabbath; and having by the death and Resurrection of our Lord Jesus, put an end to the Saturday Sabbath, and surrogated the first day of the week instead thereof to be the Lords day, wee need no new Commandement for the keeping of the Lords day, being tyed by the fourth Commandement to keep that day of seven which the Lord should choose; the Lord having chosen this, the fourth Commandement binds us to this, as it did the Jewes to the former; so in like manner, I say in the Sacrament of Baptisme.* What I conceive about the Lords day, I have before declared *Part.2. Sect.* 8. where also I shewed you how different the case of Pædobaptisme is from it, which I shall not now repeate; Onely whereas you bring the Sabbath for an Instance of a Command of God, about the Sacraments of the *Jewes*, binding us as well as the *Jewes*; you forget the marke at which you shoote, the Sabbath or Lords day being not to be reckoned among the *Jewes* Sacraments, or ours, according to the usuall Ecclesiasticall acception and definition of the word. You see now your maxime, which is the foundation of your undeniable consequence undermined, I presume you may see quickly the superstruction it selfe overturned: one blow more will doe it. You piece things together thus; "*When God made the Covenant with Abraham, and promised for his part to be the God of him and his seed; what God promised to Abraham, wee claime our part in it as the children of Abraham, and what God required on Abrahams part for the substance of obedience, wee all stand charged with, as well as Abraham; Wee as Abraham are tyed to beleeve, to love the Lord with all our heart, to have our hearts circumcised, to walke before God in uprightnesse; to instruct our children, and bring them up for God, and not for our selves, nor for the Devill, to teach them to worship God according to his revealed will, to traine them up under the Ordinances and Institutions of Gods own appointment. All these things God commanded to Abraham, and charges upon all the children of the Covenant, though there were no expresse reviving these Commands*

"*in*

in any part of the New Testament. And therefore consequently, that Command of God to Abraham, which bound his seed of the Jewes to traine up their children in that manner of worship, which was then in force, binds the seed of Abraham now, to traine up their children in conformitie to such Ordinances as are now in force. Supposing you meane by what God promised to *Abraham*, the spirituall part of the Covenant, and the persons claiming to be beleevers: I grant this passage to be truth; for these duties are morall duties, and binde at all times; but that which follows, I cannot tell how to take for any other then plain Judaisme. You say, "*And the same Command which enjoyned Abraham to seale his children with the seale of the Covenant, enjoynes us as strongly to seale ours with the seale of the Covenant, and that Command of God which expresly bound Abraham to seale his with the signe of Circumcision, which was the Sacrament then in force,* pro tempore, *for the time, doth virtually binde us to seale ours with the signe of Baptisme, which is the Sacrament now in force, and succeeds into the roome of the other by his owne Appointment.* This is your undeniable consequence, inferred from a Judaizing principle, without so much as one Scripture to prove either the principle or conclusion; Whereas I have brought ten arguments most of them out of the Scripture against your principle; and for the Conclusion, what construction can be made of it, but this, that the Command of God to Circumcise, binds us still? for that was the seale of the Covenant God enjoyned to *Abraham*, and *so the Law given by Moses as touching Ceremonies and rites, binds Christian men*, contrary to *Art.* 7. of the Church of *England*. Then must wee Circumcise our Males at the eighth day, as they did. But you say, it binds us virtually only to seale ours with the signe of Baptisme; I pray you then what meane you by this virtuall binding? The opposite Member was expresly, and *in Terminis, in termes*. Is this then your meaning, that it doth not binde expresly and *in terminis*, but virtually, that is, implicitely, and by Interpretation? Tell us then, I beseech you, by what rule of Divinitie, Logick, Grammar, or Rhetoricke, is a man to conceive this Command, *Cut off the foreskin of the secret part of all the Males in thy house the eighth day*. That is, let a Preacher of the Gospel wash with water at any time after birth the young Infants, male and female of Beleevers all over, or on the face. You call this *undeniable Consequence*: if so, it's either Demonstrative from the cause, or effect, or definition, or propertie, or the like; or it's onely Topicall, and then not undeniable; you say,

'tis

'tis by cleare consequence, you may as well say, this is good consequence, *Tu es Petrus & super hanc Petram*, *Thou art Peter, and upon this rocke*; *Ergo*, the Pope is Monarch of the Church; or with *Baronius*, *Arise Peter, kill and eate*; *Ergo*, the Pope may deprive Princes; if you can apprehend cleare consequence in it, you may enjoy your conceit; *Nos non sumus adeò sagaces, wee are not so quick-witted.* I passe to the next Command, which you thus expresse.

§. 13. That *Mat.* 28. is not a Command to baptize Infants, but contrary to it.

cc *ANother you shall finde*, Mat. 28. *where our Saviour bids them goe* cc *and teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father,* cc *of the Sonne, and of the Holy Ghost. Where you have two things; first,* cc *what they were to doe. Secondly, to whom they were to doe it; they were* cc *to preach and teach all things which he had Commanded them; that is,* cc *they were to Preach the whole Gospel*, Mark. 16. 15. *The whole Covenant* cc *of grace, containing all the promises, whereof this is one*, viz. *That God* cc *will be the God of Believers, and of their seed; that the seed of Believers* cc *are taken into Covenant with their Parents; this is a part of the Gospel* cc *preached to Abraham.* The Gospel which was preached to *Abraham*, is delivered *Galat.* 3. 8, 9. *And the Scripture foreseeing that God would justifie the heathen through faith, preached before the Gospel to Abraham, saying, In thee shall all Nations be blessed; so then they which be of faith, are blessed with faithfull Abraham.* And *Rom.* 1. 16, 17. *I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God to salvation, to every one that beleeveth, to the Jew first, and also to the Greeke. For therein is the righteousnesse of God revealed from faith to faith; as it is written, the just shall live by faith.* The like may be proved out of *Rom.* 10. and elsewhere; but it is no wrong to say it, that it is a new Gospel, to affirme, *that this is one of the Promises of the Covenant of grace, that God will be the God of Believers, and of their seed; that the seed of Believers are taken into Covenant with their Parents.* I cannot derive it's pedegree higher then *Zuinglius*. But you goe on: cc *And they were to baptize* cc *them, that is, to administer Baptisme as a seale of the Covenant to all who* cc *received the Covenant*; this is a dark Paraphrase, you expresse it clearer, *pag.* 35. *Expresse Command is there, that they should teach the heathen, and the Jewes, and make them Disciples, and then baptize them.* If your meaning be the same in both places, I am content you should Comment on your own words; you goe on; cc *Secondly, Wee have the per-* cc *sons to whom they were to do this, all Nations, whereas before the Church* cc *was tyed to one Nation, one Nation onely were Disciples, now their Com-* cc *mission*

"*mission was extended to make all Nations Disciples, every Nation which* "*should receive the faith, should be to him now as the peculiar Nation of* "*the Jewes had been in time past. In a word, Nations here are opposed to* "*the one Nation before.* I grant that Nations are opposed to one Nation, and that the Commission was extended to all Nations; which you expresse well, *pag.* 44. *Whereas before they were to goe to the lost sheepe of the house of Israel, now they were to goe unto all the world.* But what sense those words may carry, "*Every Nation which should receive the* "*faith, should be to him now as the peculiar Nation of the Jewes had been* "*in time past is doubtfull.* For either it may have this sense, Every Nation that receives the faith, that is, Believers of every Nation, shall be to mee a peculiar people, as the *Jewes* were, in the sense that *Peter* speaks, 1 *Pet.* 2. 9. and so the sense is good; or thus, When a Nation shall receive the faith, that is, a great or eminent part, the Governours and chief Cities, & representative body, shall receive the faith, that Nation shall in like manner have all their little ones capable of Baptisme, and counted visible members of the Church, as the posteritie of the *Jewes* were in the time of that Church administration. This I guesse is the businesse that is now upon the anvill, by observing sundry passages in latter Writers, with whom your Sermon agrees, as if it came out of the same forge. M^r *Blake, pag.* 20. hath these words. "*In the same sense and latitude, as Nation was taken in respect of the Cove-* "*nant of God, when the Covenant and Covenant-initiating-Sacrament* "*was restrained to that one onely Nation, where their Commission was first* "*limited: in the same sense it is to be taken (unlesse the Text expresse the* "*contrary) now this Commission is enlarged. This cannot be denied of any* "*that will have the Apostles able to know Christs meaning by his words* "*in this enlarged Commission. But Nation then, as is confessed, did com-* "*prehend all in the Nation in respect of the Covenant, and nothing is ex-* "*pressed in the Text to the contrary, therefore it is to be taken in that lati-* "*tude, to comprehend Infants.* M^r *Rutherfurd* in his peaceable and temperate plea, *Ch.* 12. *Concl.* 1. *Arg.* 7. hath these words; "*Seeing God* "*hath chosen the race and nation of the Gentiles, and is become a God to* "*us, and to our seede; the seede must be holy, with holinesse of the chosen* "*Nation, and holinesse externall of the Covenant, notwithstanding the* "*father and mother were as wicked, as the Jewes who slew the Lord of* "*glory.* And indeed those Pædobaptists are forced to say so, who justifie the practise of baptizing foundlings, infants of Papists, excommunicate persons, Apostates, if they be borne within their Parish;

thereby directly croſſing their own tenent, *That this is the priviledge of a believer from the Covenant of grace, I will be the God of a believer, and his ſeed*; And the Apoſtles words, 1 *Cor.*7.14. according to their own expoſition, which is, *that the children whereof one of the parents is not ſanctified by the faith of the other, are federally uncleane*; nor conſidering that this practiſe of baptizing all in the Pariſh, aroſe not from any conceit of the federall holineſſe of a Nation, but from the conceit of *Cyprian*, with his 66 Biſhops, *that the grace of God is to be denied to none that are borne of men*: upon which ground, and the neceſſitie of baptiſme to ſave a childe from periſhing, as of old, ſo ſtill among the common people, and officiating Prieſts, children are baptized, without any relation to Covenant-holineſſe, particular or nationall. But I leave this to the *Independents* to agitate, who have in this point the advantage; and returne to the Text, *Mat.*28. 19. Concerning which the queſtion is, what ἀυτὸς, or [*them*] refers to in our Saviours words: whether *all Nations* muſt be the ſubſtantive to it, without any other circumſcription, or the word, ἀνθρώπους, *men and women*, as the Author of infants baptizing proved lawfull by Scriptures, or μαθητὰς, *Diſciples*, included in the verbe μαθητεύσατε, which may be tranſlated, "*make Diſciples*. That Author denies not, *but that the verbe may ſig-* "*nifie to make Diſciples, yet by the ſubject matter, which it is here taken* "*and uſed to expreſſe, it muſt be taken for to teach, and not to make Diſci-* "*ples: becauſe to make Diſciples was not in the power of the Apoſtles (up-* "*on whom the command lay) it being the peculiar of God to frame the heart* "*to ſubmit unto and embrace the Apoſtles teaching, and to caſt them into* "*the forme and obedience of it, and ſo to make them Diſciples: but to teach* "*and thereby endeavour (as much as in them lay) to make Diſciples, was in* "*their power and duty: and is all the whole meaning of the word here,* "*therefore properly, and rightly rendred teach, and not, make Diſciples.* But that the word doth not ſignifie onely ſimply, to teach, whether with effect or without, but to teach till they become diſciples, is plain by the uſe of it elſewhere, in all the places it is uſed in the new Teſtament. *Mat.* 13. 52. πᾶς γραμματεὺς μαθητευθεὶς, *Every Scribe that is ſo taught, as to become a diſciple.* Mat. 27. 57. ὃς καὶ αὐτὸς ἐμαθήτευσε τῷ Ἰησοῦ, rendered by *Beza*, Vulgar, ours, &c. *who alſo himſelfe was Jeſus diſciple*: where the noune μαθητὴς *diſciple*, is included in the verbe, and expreſſed by *John, Cha.* 19. 38. ὢν μαθητὴς τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, *being a diſciple of Jeſus.* *Act.* 14. 21. μαθητεύσαντες ἱκανοὺς, which though our tranſlatours render, and *had taught many*; yet *Beza* renders it, *Diſcipulos multos ad-*

junxiſſent,

junxissent, and had joyned many disciples. So plaine it is that the noune μαθητας, *disciples*, is included in the verbe μαθητευω, to make *disciples*; and that it is put not for simple teaching that is without effect; for then the Apostle might be said μαθητευειν, when he did preach to the *Athenians* who mocked, *Acts* 17.32. and the unbelieving *Jewes*, *Acts* 28.24. for they were taught: but for teaching, *cum effectu*, with effect, so as that the persons taught became disciples. And Mr *Edwards* lately at *Christ-Church* averred in all the Dictionaries he could peruse, it did not signifie simply to teach, coming from μανθανω, *to learne*, he might have added coming from the noune μαθητης, *a disciple*. As for the objection; *Christ should command them that which was not in their power.* I answer, it was in their power, and their dutie not onely to teach simply, so as to propound things to them, but also so as to bring them to be disciples, which they could doe, not as principall, sole, supreme agents, but as *workers with God*, συνεργοι, as it is 2 *Cor.* 6.1. subordinate instruments to him they could, in which respect they are called *wise Master-builders, that beget men by the Gospel, save and convert them, espouse them to Christ*, &c. Even as the knife cuts, though not without the hand; as an Ambassadour makes peace, though not without his Prince. And this might be rightly charged to them, as it was charged to *Peter, to feed Christs sheepe, and to strengthen his brethren*, though he could doe neither of himselfe. But that "Author hath another exception, *that* μαθηται, disciples, *is of the masculine gender, and if that were the substantive to* αυτους, *them, then women should be excluded.* To this I answer, that there be hundreds of places, where the masculine comprehends both sexes, as *Joh.* 3. 16. πας ὁ πιστευων, *every one that believeth*, though in the masculine gender, yet comprehends women. *Rom.* 5. 12. εις παντας ανθρωπους, *upon all men*, comprehends women too: and women are comprehended under μαθηται, *disciples*, *Acts* 1. 15. &c. Besides that Author did not consider it seems, that if ανθρωπους, men, were the substantive, and αυτους, *them*, in the masculine gender were the adjective, women if this reason were worth any thing, should be excluded however. And for that which he saith, "*that some say* αυτους, *them, cannot agree with* εθνη *nations*, because of a different gender, though it may be a reason, and *Piscator* made use of it thus farre, *αυτους syntaxi refertur ad sensum, non ad vocem: nam præcessit* εθνη, *them, in the syntaxis is referred to the sense, not to the word, for nations went before:* yet I fasten nothing on it, sith it cannot be denied that Enallage, Heterosis, or change of gender is frequent.

But for my part, I conceive that the sense includes both, neither separately, both conjunctly, and that *αὐτὸς, them*, referres both to *μαθητὰς, disciples*, and to *ἔθνη, nations*; thus, *μαθητὰς ἐκ πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν, disciples of all Nations*, and must be thus expounded, *make disciples of all nations, baptizing them*, that is, *the disciples of all nations*. And this is agreeable to your Paraphrase, *pag.* 35. *teach the heathen, and Jewes, and make them disciples, and then baptize them*; and *pag.* 38. *make all nations disciples*. And *Beza annot. in Matth.* 28. 19. *μαθητεύσατε, id est, discipulos mihi facite ex omnibus gentibus, make disciples to me of all nations*: and a little after, *μαθητεύειν, ergo hoc loco, non neutropassivè pro discipulum esse, sed activè accipitur quasi in Conjugatione Hiphil, ac si dicas discipulare, to teach therefore in this place is not taken neuterpassively for to be a disciple, but actively, as if it were in the Conjugation Hiphil, as if you should say, to make to learne*. Some doe make the substantive *credentes, believers*, and that parallel place, *Mark.* 16. 16. may leade us to it; but *disciples* and *believers* being all one in this matter, it comes to one passe. I rather, as I said, make the substantive *μαθητὰς ἐκ πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν, disciples out of all nations*, for these reasons; first, because it suits with the expression, *Joh.* 4. 1. *πλείονας μαθητὰς ποιεῖ καὶ βαπτίζει, he maketh more disciples and baptizeth*; where making disciples is put before baptizing, and baptizing of Christ by his Apostles is *of disciples*: they that were baptized by *John*, or Christs disciples, are every where called *the disciples of John*, and *of Jesus*, and the doctrine they taught them, *their baptisme*, Acts 19. 1, 2. and elsewhere. Secondly, because usually hearing and believing are put before baptizing, *Acts* 2. 41. *Acts* 8. 12. 38. *Acts* 10. 48. *Acts* 16. 15. 33. and so were called disciples, which shews that the Apostles so construed the precept of Christ to baptize *disciples*. Besides, if [*them*] were referred to nations or men, without due circumscription of disciples or believers, as a limitation, directing whom to baptize, it would follow, that either they might baptize any man or nation in the world, whether taught or not, and if so, then the *Spaniards* practise of forcing droves of *Indians* to baptisme, and that practise of baptizing a Kingdome upon the Kings conversion and command, without sufficient precedent teaching, were justifiable; or else they must baptize none till all men or all nations were to be baptized together.

There hath been vented lately, in a little paper, a very absurd one, though it be licensed, entituled, *A Declaration against the Anabaptists*; in which the Author saith, " *that making Disciples, is to be done*

" *by*

« *by baptizing them*; which if true, then the Apostles needed to have done nothing else, in observance of that command of discipling, but to baptize, and it would serve for a good plea for non-preaching, or meer officiating Priests: whereas in *Mark.* 16. 15. which I think will not be denied to be parallel to this, *Matth.* 28. 19. *Disciple all nations, is preach the Gospel to every creature.* But this conceit is so absurd, that I presume none that hath any wit will entertain it, though the paper be licensed. That which I have hitherto discoursed, tends to this, to prove, that when Christ saith, *Teach all nations, and baptize them*, his meaning is, by *preaching the Gospel to all nations, make them Disciples, and baptize those that become Disciples of all nations.* Now, concerning the Position, which after Mr. *Blake* and Mr. *Rutherfurd*, you seem to imbrace, concerning the federall or externall holinesse of a believing or chosen nation, giving right to the Infants of that nation to be baptized. Give me leave to argue a little: First, if Infants may be baptized, because they are born in a chosen nation, or a believing nation, then there may be a rule whereby we may know when a nation may be called a believing, or chosen nation, when not; otherwise we should not know when to make use of this title to baptisme, when not: and it were absurd to conceive God should give us a rule, and no direction how to make use of it. But no rule can be assigned whereby to know when a nation is a believing, chosen, or discipled nation, giving right to baptize Infants of that nation, when not; *Ergo*, If it be said they may be known, in that they are descended from such a Believer as *Abraham*. I reply, then God would have left us a note to know such a nation by, as he did *Abrahams* posterity by Circumcision: But there is no such note, nor any such nation marked out; this were indeed contray to the appointment of admitting all nations. If it be said when the king of a countrey is a Believer, this is no rule; for it may be he may be a Believer, and all the rest unbelievers, and then the practice of baptizing Infidels afore they are instructed at the command of Princes: As when *Charles* the great forced the *Saxons* to be Christians, were to be justified. If it be said, the nation is a believing nation, when the representative body believes, and so the children of that people may be baptized: I answer, the representative body may be Believers, and the greatest part Infidels, Papists, *&c.* these Infidels children must then be baptized; yea, the Infidels themselves, by vertue of an implicit faith in their governours faith, for they are a part of the nation. And therefore if

Mr. *Blakes*

Mr. *Blakes* Argument be good: *The Infants of any nation make up a part of the nation, and the nation where they came was to be diſciples; and therefore the Infants to be baptized*: the ſame reaſon holds for Infidels of age, for they are a part of the nation. If it be ſaid, it is a believing nation, when the greateſt part are Believers, how ſhall that be known? How ſhall a miniſter do when he cannot come to the knowledge of it? muſt he ſtay till they be counted by poll, as the Sheriffes do at the election of Knights of the Shire, and upon Certificate that the major part is believing, then baptize? Why did not the Apoſtles ſo, nor any other Miniſters to this day? How ill would it fare with ſome poor Chriſtians, who are but a handfull in reſpect of the multitude of unbelievers of their own nation, as in the Primitive times, when Princes and States were adverſaries to Chriſtianity? If it be ſaid, when all *adulti* of ripe yeers are believers, then ſuch a right is aſſerted as never was, nor perhaps ever will be, except *when all Iſrael ſhall be ſaved*; and ſo no Infants ſhall be baptized on this ground. Secondly, but, if it could be reſolved what number or ſort of Believers make a believing nation, giving title to Infant-baptiſme, yet there would be uncertainty concerning the kind of believing, which might denominate a believing or choſen nation, having federall or externall holineſſe, ſuch as may create title to the baptiſme of Infants of that nation. There are ſome nations that are reckoned among Believers, which yet are miſ-believers, as Heretiques, for inſtance, the nation of the *Goths*, who were *Arians*; or groſly Idolatrous, as the *Spaniards*, ſhall they give title to their children to baptiſme, when without repentance they cannot be deemed capable of communion in the body of Chriſt? Thirdly, if Infants of wicked parents be capable of baptiſme, becauſe born in a believing nation, then this priviledge agrees to them, either in reſpect of their deſcent, or the place of their birth, or both. If in reſpect of their deſcent, then either their deſcent within mans memory, or their deſcent beyond all the memory of man. If of their deſcent within memory and knowledge, then Foundlings have no title hereby to Baptiſme, of whoſe parentage there is no knowledge, neerer or remoter, who are nevertheleſſe baptized: If of that beyond memory, it muſt be upon ſuch a ground, as is common to all Infants in the world, which are deſcended from ſome Believer, in ſome precedent generation; or elſe ſuch a rule muſt be ſet down, as hath no certainty in it, by which to adminiſter that Ordinance: If from the place of birth only, becauſe

cause the Church of God is there, then children of *Turks* or *Jews* are to be baptized, because born in *London:* If by reason of both, when they concurre, and not otherwise, then the children of an *English* Embassador at *Constantinople*, or Agent at *Aleppo*, supposed to be wicked, as the *Jews* that persecuted Christ, loose this priviledge, because born out of *England:* If there be any other nationall respect upon which this supposed priviledge may be fastened, it either hath these or the like inconveniences consequent on it. Fourthly, if there be such a federall holinesse of a chosen, discipled, or believing nation as may make the Infants of that nation, though their parents be openly wicked, capable of Baptisme; this right must come from some grant or charter or other. We find indeed, God would have the posterity of *Abraham*, and all the males in that nation circumcised: So God appointed it, what ever their parents were, for reasons before rehearsed; but there is no such grant, promise, covenant, or appointment now to any nation of *Gentiles*, as was then to the posterity of *Abraham*, because the reasons now cease, the Messiah is now come, and the prerogatives are now personall, not nationall, not one nation hath priviledge above another as a nation, but personall, as a Believer in any nation. As for the Text which M^r. *Rutherfurd* alledgeth, to wit, *Rom.* 11. 16. it hath been examined before, and shewed out of the Text, that holinesse of the branches there, is meant personall by faith; and the objection against it which he makes, to wit, "*that then the children of a believing parent should* "*be all sanctified, whereas the contrary is manifest: as in* Absolom, *the* "*son of* David, proceeds upon this mistake, that by *the root and first fruit*, are meant any Ancestor; whereas it is meant of *Abraham* the Father of the faithfull, as *Deodate* in his *Annot.* on *Rom.* 11. 16. or, at most, *Abraham*, *Isaac* and *Jacob*, in whose names all the elect are comprehended, when God calls himself *The God of* Abraham, Isaac *and* Jacob, as our Saviour intimates, *Luke* 20.37,38. *Mat.*22.32. *Mar.*12. 26,27. And for that which he saith, "*that the* Jews *in* Pauls *time were* "*holy by covenant, howbeit for the present, the sons were branches broken off* "*for unbelief*, if it be meant of the *Jews* broken off through unbelief, in respect of their present state, they were not holy by covenant. Only thus far the Jewish nation in *Pauls* time is said to be holy, either in respect of the remnant, according to the election of Grace, mentioned, *vers.* 5. of which he was one; or in respect of the posterity that should afterwards be called according to the promise

misse of God to *Abraham*, in which sense they were federally holy; yet this did neither give right for the baptizing of children of unbelieving *Jewes* in *Pauls* time, nor now. "*And for that which he saith* "*that God hath chosen the race and nation of the* Gentiles, *it is not right*: For God hath not chosen simply the race and nation of the *Gentiles*, but a people to himself, out of the race and nation of the *Gentiles*, as it is said, *Rev.* 5. 7. *Thou hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and nation.* As for Mr. *Blakes* Argument, because it falls in with your reason, I shall answer them together in that which followes. You say; "*Now we know, that when that one na-* "*tion of the* Jews *were made Disciples, and circumcised, their Infants were* "*made disciples (made to belong to Gods School) and circumcised with* "*them, when that nation was made disciples in* Abrahams *loynes, and* "*circumcised their seed also was the same, when that nation was taken out* "*of* Egypt, *and actually made Disciples, their children were also with them.* "This is your first Argument to prove a command by cleare consequence, from *Mat.* 28. 19. for baptizing Infants. Now the strength of it lies in these suppositions, First, "*that Christ did bid them* "*baptize all nations, after the manner that the* Jews *did circumcise one na-* "*tion.* And Mr. *Blake* doth conceit this so strongly, that he saith, "*this cannot be denyed of any, that will have the Apostles to be able to know* "*Christs meaning by his words in this enlarged Commission.* Secondly, "*that the nation of the* Jews *were discipled when they were circumcised.* I do not impute it to Mr. *Blake* through defect of ability to understand, but through the strong hold which these points have in his minde, *that Baptisme succeeds Circumcision, in the place, roome, and use of it, and the covenant of the Gospel is all one, with the covenant made to* Abraham, that he imagines there should be such an allusion to circumcision, as that the Disciples must understand Christs meaning, whom to baptize from the Precept of circumcision, *Gen.* 17. but in mine apprehension, there is no colour for such a conceit. 'Tis true, he enlargeth their commission, and bids them, *Go and make Disciples of all nations*; or, as it is in *Mark*, *Preach the Gospel to every creature, and then to baptize the Disciples of all nations*; but this enlargement of commission was not in opposition to the restriction about circumcision, *Gen.* 17. but in opposition to the restriction, *Mat.* 10. 5, 6. as your self rightly expresse it, *pag.* 44. And for that expression, "*that the nation of the* Jews *were discipled, that their Infants were* "*discipled, that the nation was made Disciples in* Abrahams *loines*; it is such

such a construction of the word μαθητευσατε, *make Disciples*, as I believe no Lexicon, nor, I think, any Expositor to this day made of the word, which plainly signifies so to teach, as that the persons taught do learn, and accordingly profesſe the things taught; and our Lord Christ in *Mark* expresseth it by preaching the Gospel, and accordingly, the Apostles by preaching, did μαθητευσαι, *disciple*, Acts 14. 21. which how it can be said of Infants that can neither understand, nor speak the doctrine of the Gospel preached to them, without a miracle, I know not. I make no question, but *Abraham* did teach his children, and make them Disciples, and that the *Israelites* did teach and make Disciples of their children, as soon as they could understand the things of God; but that they should be disciples in *Abrahams* loynes, is such a piece of language as I never read in the Bible, nor in any Author, but such as torture words to make them speak what they would have them. And sure, if the Apostles had understood our Saviours command thus: [*Disciple all nations baptizing them*; that is, *Admit the infants of all nations to baptisme, as the* Jews *did the male Infants of that one nation to circumcision*] they might have saved themselves a great deal of labour of preaching afore baptisme, and of baptizing females, and would have left us some precedent of such a practice. But you adde further: "*And we know, that in every* "*nation, the children make a great part of the nation, and are alwayes in-*"*cluded under every administration to the nation, whether promises or* "*threatnings, priviledges or burthens, miracles or judgements, unlesse they* "*be excepted: So are they in families, in cities, it being the way of the* "*Scripture, when speaking indefinitely of a people, nation, city, or fami-*"*ly, to be either saved or damned, to receive mercies or punishments, ex-*"*presly to except Infants, when they are to be excepted, as we see in* "*the judgement that befell* Israel *in the Wilderneſſe; when all that re-*"*bellious company that came out of* Egypt *was to perish by Gods righteous* "*doome, their little ones were expresly excepted,* Numb. 14. 31. *and in* "*the covenant actually entred into by the body of the nation,* Nehem. 10. *it* "*is expresly limited to them who had knowledge and understanding: And* "*the Disciples who received this commission, knew well, that in all Gods* "*former administrations, when any parents were made disciples, their chil-*"*dren were taken in with them to appertain to the same school; and there-*"*fore it behooved the Lord to give them a caution, for the leaving out of* "*Infants in this new administration, that they might know his minde,* "*had he intended to have them left out, which that ever he did, in word*

" *or deed, cannot be found in Scripture.* The Lord hath plainly given a caution in Scripture for the leaving out Infants in this administration according to ordinary rule: For, in that he directs them to baptize disciples upon preaching, he doth exclude Infants, who are not such disciples, nor according to ordinary providence can be. And this the Apostles could easily understand, as knowing that under the term *Disciple*, in common speech, and in the whole new Testament, those only are meant, who being taught, professed the doctrine taught by such a one, as *Johns Disciples*, *Christs Disciples*, *the disciples of the Pharisees*, Luke 5. 33. *the disciples of the perverters*, Acts 20. 30. and accordingly they administred Baptisme. And in that Christ appoints these to be baptized, he excludes others: For the appointment of Christ, is the rule according to which we are to administer holy things, and he that doth otherwise, follows his own invention, and is guilty of will-worship; and thus we construe the meaning of the Holy Ghost in other appointments: As, because it is said, 1 *Cor.* 11. 28. *Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat*, therefore Infants are excluded, though Infant-communion was held lawfull and necessary for six hundred yeers in the Church: Wine is appointed in the Eucharist, therefore not Water mixt with Wine, as the *Papists* contend: Water in Baptisme, therefore not salt, chrisme, spettle: the Preacher to baptize, therefore not women, or private persons: Males to be circumcised, therefore no females: *two shall be one flesh*, therefore no more then *two*, against Polygamie, *Matth.* 19. 5. So that unless you will alter the definition of wil-worship, according to *Mat.* 15. 9. in point of worship, that is excluded which is not expressed. And therefore, whereas you say, [" *it behoved the Lord to give them a* " *caution for the leaving out of Infants in this new administration, that* " *they might know his minde, if that he intends to have them left out,* " *which that ever he did, in word or deed, cannot be found in Scripture*]. I may more truly invert thus; it behoved the Lord to give them a Precept for the putting in of Infants in this (which you truly call) new administration, as being not the same with Circumcision, that they might know his mind, if that he intends to have them put in, which that ever he did, in word or deed, cannot be found in the Scripture. Certainly, you may as soon extract water out of a flint, as draw a command to baptize Infants out of this Scripture, by any expresse terms, or virtuall consequence: but the ordinary baptizing of Infants is, and may be proved from this Text to be a wil-worship, if

Master *Baley*. A diswasion from the error of the times, *ch.* 8. *p.* 175. argues from this very text in like manner, to prove that only Ministers have power to preach the Word ordinarily.

if this Scripture be the rule of administring ordinarily that Ordinance, which it indeed is, and hath been still taken to be. As for that which you say, "*The children make in every nation a great part of* "*the nation*, so do the Infidels that are *adulti*, of ripe yeers; and yet are not therefore included in this speech, *Teach all nations, and baptize them*; and as for that which you say, "*the children are alwayes* "*included under every administration to the nation, whether promises or* "*threatnings, priviledges or benefits, mercies or judgements, unlesse they* "*be excepted*; therefore here Infants are included, when it is said, *Go teach all nations, baptizing them.* I answer: First, that this speech in so universall and ample expressions, if understood of temporall judgements and mercies, is contrary to *Ezek.* 17. 20. *Jer.* 31. 29, 30. *Isai.* 6. 13. and 10. 22. if of eternall, as it seems you mean, when you say, [*to be either saved or damned*] it is contrary to *Rom.* 9. 13. 27. 29. *Rom.* 13. 5. Secondly, if it were true, yet makes nothing to the purpose, sith this Precept is not an appointment to baptize all nations as nations without any further circumscription, for then every person in the world might be baptized, but disciples of all nations; and therefore it is not a nationall priviledge, but a personall, belonging to Disciples or Believers of every nation. And for that which you say, *The* "*disciples who received this commission, knew well, that in all Gods former* "*administrations, when any parents were made disciples, their children were* "*taken in with them to appertain to the same school*; if it be thus understood, that God required that parents being called, should instruct their children, and so the children *in potentia propinqua*, in a neer possibility, were disciples, it is granted, according to that which God speaks of *Abraham*, Gen. 18. 19. and requires of the *Israelites*, Deut. 6. 7. But if you mean it thus, that the Disciples knew, that when any parents were made disciples, barely and precisely for this reason without any other, the children were actually disciples, and so to have Baptisme administred to them, it is an untruth, that hath no ground for it. But you have yet somewhat more to say for Infants being disciples; and therefore you thus answer an objection. "*If it be said* "*they are not capable of being disciples, I answer, as capable as the Infants* "*of the* Jews *and* Proselytes *were when they were made disciples.* It is granted, but neither were the Infants of *Jews* or *Proselytes* capable of being actually disciples in an ordinary way, nor are ours. You go on: "*And besides, they are devoted to be disciples, being to be trained up* "*by their parents, who are from their Infancy to teach them the knowledge of*

"*Christ.* It is hard to say, that parents are to teach Infants from their infancy the Knowledge of Christ: For, though it is said of *Timothy*, *Thou hast known the Holy Scriptures*, ἀπὸ βρέφους, 2 *Tim.* 3. 15. yet our Translators would not render it *from an Infant*, but from *a child*. But however, if their parents be to teach them from their infancy, and the parents devote them to be disciples, yet this doth not make them disciples actually, but potentially, they may never be disciples for all that. But you tell us: "*And at the present, they are capable* "*of his own teaching.* I deny not but Infants are capable of Christs own teaching, yea, of actuall faith, yea, of actuall profession of faith. The same power that could make *John Baptist* in his mothers womb sensible of the presence of Christs mother, and to leap for joy, that could open the mouth of *Balaams* Asse, can out of the mouth *of babes and sucklings perfect praise*. But then this is done in an extraordinary way, and *extraordinary accidents make not an ordinary rule*. But you adde: "*And sure I am, in Christs own dialect, to belong to Christ,* "*and to be a Disciple of Christ, or to bear the name of Christ, are all one*; "*and that such Infants do belong to Christ, and bear the name of Christ,* "*I have sufficiently proved already, and in the margine you cite* Mat. 10. "42. Mar. 9. 41. Mat. 18. 5. Mr. *Blake* pag. 21. seems to triumph in this Argument, when he saith: "*Who then is not afraid to refuse* "*them, who will receive Christ? Who will not baptize them, that is* "*willing to baptize disciples in the name of Christ?* But this is a triumph afore victory. The plain truth is, there's never a one of all the three Texts, speaks of little ones in respect of age. The first, *Mat.* 10. 42. is meant of the Apostles; and as *Beza* in his *Annotations* sayes rightly, *Parvos vocat per concessionem suos discipulos, homines nimirum coram mundo viles & abjectos, He calleth his Disciples little ones by concession, to wit, men vile and abject before the world*; so that they are called little, in respect of their outward estate in the world, not in respect of age. The second Text, *Mar.* 9. 41. hath not the term little ones, or children at all, and it is expressly meant of the Apostles, ὅτι χριστοῦ ἐστε, *because ye belong to Christ.* The third Text, *Matth.* 18. 5. is as little to the purpose. For, first the word is not Infant, but little childe, who may be one able to speak: secondly, one such little child, is not meant of a little childe in age, but a little child in affection, though an old man in age, resembled by a little child, as appeareth out of *vers.* 3. one that is converted, and made as a little child, *vers.* 4. one that humbles himself as a little childe, *vers.* 6. one of those little

ones

ones that believe in him. And therefore *Beza* rightly on *verſ.* 5. hath this Annot. *Puerulum talem παιδίον τοῦτο, id eſt, quempiam ita ſe demittentem, ut puerum referat: nec enim proprie de pueris agit; ſuch a little childe, that is, any one that doth ſo humble himſelf, that he reſembles a little childe: For he doth here properly deale concerning children:* And ſo the *Syriack* Interpreter, *qui ſit ſicut puer iſte, who may be as this boy.* But you have yet one place to prove that Infants are diſciples, which you thus expreſſe. *And I deſire it may be ſeriouſly weighed, whether that expreſſion, Acts* 15. 10. "*Now therefore why tempt yee* "*God, to put a yoak upon the necks of the Diſciples, do not neceſſitate* "*us to give the name of Diſciples to Infants, as well as to grown men:* "*For I reaſon thus; All they upon whoſe necks thoſe falſe teachers would* "*have put the yoak of Circumciſion, are called diſciples, and to be called* "*diſciples; but they would have put the yoak of Circumciſion upon In-* "*fants, as well as grown men; therefore Infants as well as grown men are* "*called diſciples, and to be called ſo. The* Major *is undeniable, the* Minor "*I prove thus: They who preſſed Circumciſion to be in force according to* "*the manner of* Moſes *Law, and would put it upon their necks after the* "*manner of* Moſes *his Law, they would put it upon Infants of thoſe who* "*were in covenant with God, as well as upon the necks of thoſe who were* "*grown men; for ſo* Moſes *Law required: But theſe falſe teachers preſ-* "*ſed Circumciſion to be in force, as is apparent,* Acts 15. 1. I have ſeriouſly weighed this Text, *Acts* 15. 10. as you deſire, and I find no neceſſity nor colour of giving to Infants the name of Diſciples from that Text. And in anſwer to your Argument, though you ſay, it is undeniable, yet I have the boldneſſe to deny the *Major* in your Proſyllogiſme; For, *though it be true that they are called diſciples upon whoſe necks they would put the yoak of Circumciſion,* yet it is not ſaid, they would put it only on Diſciples, it is more probable they indeavoured to put it on the necks of all, whether Diſciples or others, as univerſally neceſſary to ſalvation, *v.* 1. And therefore your *Major* is not certain, that *all they, upon whoſe necks thoſe falſe teachers would have put the yoak of Circumciſion are called diſciples:* The *Minor* likewiſe in your Proſyllogiſme, I deny and in your latter Syllogiſme, framed to prove it, I deny the *Major:* For, though I deny not that they would have had Infants as well as converted *Gentiles* circumciſed; yet the putting the yoak of Circumciſion is not actuall circumciſion in their fleſh, *for that they were able to bear for many ages*; and at this day *Mahometanes* and *Abaſſine* Chriſtians do ſtill bear, as well as *Jews*; but the

the yoak of circumcision is the necessity of it on mens consciences, and therewith the whole Law of *Moses*, vers. 5. and that as necessary to salvation, *v.* 1. and therefore *Peter* having said, *v.* 10. *Why tempt ye God to put a yoak upon the necks of the Disciples?* addes, *v.* 11. *but we believe that through the grace of the Lord Jesus we shall be saved even as they*, plainly implying, that the yoak he meant, was the necessity of Circumcision, and keeping *Moses* his law to salvation. Now, this yoak was not put upon Infants, but upon brethren taught the necessity of it, *vers.* 1. And thus, like another *Sisyphus*, the stone you roul returns upon you: *Volvendo saxum sudas, nec proficis hilum, you sweat in rouling a stone, and yet profit not a whit*; and you are so far from proving by virtuall and undeniable consequence, a command to baptize Infants of Believers, according to ordinary rule, that on the contrary, this Text, *Mat.* 26. 19. clearly proves Infants are not by ordinary rule to be baptized, because Disciples of all nations, and no other, are appointed to be baptized; and therefore baptizing of Infants is besides the institution, and so wil-worship. But yet Mr. *Blake* hath one Text for a reserve, which he thus puts in array: "*Let that Text of the Prophet be well weighed,* "*where speaking by the Spirit of prophecy of the rejection of the* Jews, *and* "*the glorious call of the* Gentiles *in their stead, in that ample way, as it is* "*there set out, hath these words: Behold, I will lift up mine hand to the* "Gentiles, *and set up my Standard to the people, and they shall bring thy* "*sons in their arms; and thy daughters shall be carried on their shoulders,* "Isai. 49. 22. *If there were but such an hint, as that by way of pro-* "*phecy to have left them behind, we should from some have heard of it with* "*a noise.* It may be truly said, the alledging this Text for Infant-baptisme, is but a noise, *vox & præterea nihil, a voyce, and nothing beside*, as the *Spartan* said of the Nightingal. To it I answer, that the allusion is to nursing-fathers and mothers, carrying children on shoulders, and in their arms, and the speech is metaphoricall, as *Junius* saith in his *annot.* in locum, *Hæc omnia allegoricè dicuntur, all these things are spoken allegorically*, and may be either understood, as he speaks, *of the spirituall amplifying of Christs Kingdom*; and so children were brought on arms and shoulders among *Gentiles* by preaching and instruction, as when the Apostle saith, *he was gentle among the* Thessalonians *as a nurse that cherisheth her children*, 1 Thes. 2. 7. or, it may be understood of the return of the *Jews* from captivity; and that the following verses make more probable; nor is there a word in the Text that I observe, of the rejection of the *Jews*, as he sayes, but of their restitution.

But

But if it must be understood properly, which hath no likelihood, it may be as well conceived of bringing their children to have laying on of hands, as baptizing of them. I go on to that which followes in your Sermon.

§. 14. Of examples in Scripture of Infants Baptisme, particularly of baptizing of houshold.

cc *ANother command by good consequence for the baptizing of infants, you shall finde in the forementioned place: when the Apostle exhorteth them to repent and be baptized, &c. because the promise was made to them and to their children, which as I shewed clearly proves that the children of such as beleeve and are baptized, are taken into Covenant, and therefore by good consequence they are to receive the seale of the Covenant, the Text not onely shewing that they are within the Covenant, but also that a right to Baptisme is a consequence of being within the Covenant.* This text hath been examined before, and it hath been proved that the promise there is the sending of Christ, who was raised up to blesse them and their children first, then those that were a farre off, being called, and that the promise doth not belong to their children, as the children of beleevers, but as called, and that the promise is not alledged as of it selfe giving right for them or their children to be baptized, without any other consideration, but as a motive and incouragement for them to repent, and so to be baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus, for the remission of sinnes, notwithstanding they had crucified the Lord of glory, and wished his blood to be upon them, and their children; which being thus rightly understood, is so farre from proving a command to baptize infants, that on the contrary, it proves they are not to be baptized. You say further; cc *Thus for Commands: for examples, though there should be none, there is no great argument in it, when the rule is so plaine, yet we have examples enough by good consequence.* It is true, if the rule were plaine, there would be no need of an example; and on the other side, if wee had regulating examples, we should thereby know how to interpret the rule. But whereas you say, *wee have examples enough by good consequence*, it may be well suspected, these examples will prove like the commands, by consequence meere conjectures and conceits of men that would have it so. But let us heare what you say. cc *For you shall finde, that the Gospel tooke place just as the old administration, by bringing in whole families together; when Abraham was taken in, his whole familie was taken in with him; when any of the Gentiles turned proselytes, ordinarily their whole families came in with them; so in this new*

cc *administra-*

" *administration, usually if the master of the house turned Christian, his* " *whole familie came in and were baptized with him; the whole house-* " *hold of Cornelius, the first converted Gentile,* Act. 11. 14. *the houshold* " *of Stephanus, the houshold of Aristobulus, the houshold of Narcissus, the* " *houshold of Lydia, the houshold of the Gaoler: These are examples not to* " *be contemned.* True: nor any part of holy Scripture which is written for our learning, but in all these, there is no example of an infants baptizing in the Scripture. You say, " *the Gospel tooke place just as the* " *old administration, by bringing in whole families together.* By the old administration, you meane circumcision. But wee doe not finde the Gospel or Baptisme tooke place just in the manner of circumcision; for in circumcision, it was but in one familie singled out, of the males onely, whether in the covenant of grace or not, children or servants, elder or younger, at eight dayes old, in the house, by the Master of the familie, or others in his stead. But in Baptisme it is cleane otherwise, so that you might more truly have said, the new administration of Baptisme is just opposite to that of circumcision, yea in respect of that one thing wherein you make them agree so well, the bringing in of whole families together, it was but contingently so, not alwayes so, nor constantly so, according to any promise or prophecy, and when it did so happen, we finde not any infant baptized, nor any intimation of baptizing households, in conformitie to the administration of circumcision. And this may appeare by going through the examples of baptizing in the new Testament. Concerning *John* the Baptist, it is said, *Mat.*3. 5. *Then went out to him Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan, and were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sinnes.* Luk. 3. 29. *And all the people that heard him, and the Publicans justified God, being baptized with the baptisme of John; but the Pharisees and Lawyers rejected the counsell of God against themselves, being not baptized of him.* Concerning Christ and his disciples, it is said, *Joh.*4.1,2. *When the Lord knew how the Pharisees heard that Jesus made and baptized more disciples then Iohn (though Iesus himselfe baptized not but his disciples.)* In these examples the practise of baptizing, is not by taking in a familie, but by admitting all that would become disciples over all the Countries. After the ascension of Christ, the first example of Baptisme, is that *Acts* 2. 44. and there it is said, *They that gladly received the Word were baptized*; and these were they to whom he had said, *ver.* the 39. the *promise is to you and to your children; and there were added unto them about three thousand soules,* and

yet

yet never an infant baptized, unleſſe we ſhall take M^r *Thomas Goodwins* conceit for an Oracle (poſſibly the more willingly taken up, that it might ſeeme the more credible, that the Church of *Jeruſalem* was but one ſingle formed Congregation in a Church way) that therefore it is ſaid, *There were added three thouſand ſoules*; to intimate, that there were men, women and children added: he might have obſerved how ridiculous ſuch a conceit is by that which follows, *ver.* 42. *And they continued ſtedfaſtly in the Apoſtles doctrine, and fellowſhip, and in breaking of bread, and in prayer, and feare came upon every ſoule, &c.* Which if he can apply to infants, *Erit mihi magnus Apollo*, I ſhall take his words for Oracles. Now ſure theſe three thouſand ſoules were not one family. The next example is of the *Samaritanes*, of whom it is ſaid, *Acts* 8. 12. *That when they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the Kingdome of God, and the name of Jeſus Chriſt, they were baptized men and women.* Where it is plaine, that in a manner the whole Citie were baptized; for *ver.* 6. it is ſaid, *The multitude with one accord gave heed to that which Philip ſpake*; ver. 13. *Simon himſelfe* that did before lead them, *now believed*; and *ver.* 14. *Samaria received the word of God*, and yet not an infant mentioned to be baptized, *but thoſe that believed, and received the word of God*; nor was this adminiſtration by taking in of a familie, but rather of a Citie. The next are of the Eunuch, *Acts* 8. 38. and *Paul*, Acts 9. 18. which were ſingle believing perſons, not a whole familie. The next is of *Cornelius*, of whom you gather from *Acts* 11. 14. "*That his whole houſhold were baptized.* But it is true withall, that his houſe was not an ordinary familie, but a garriſon of Souldiers. 2. *That he called together his kinſmen and neare friends*, Acts 10. 24. 3. That *ver.* 2. *This whole houſe feared God.* 4. That no other are nominated to have been baptized, but thoſe *who had heard the word*, ver. 44. *which ſpake with tongues, and magnified God*, ver. 46. *which received the holy Ghoſt*, ver. 47. *who were ſtyed by Peters words*, Acts 11. 14. which I preſume will not be affirmed of infants. "Then you mention *the houſhold of Stephanus, which is ſaid to be baptized*, 2 Cor. 1. 16. and alſo *Chap.* 16. 15. is ſaid *to addict themſelves to the miniſtery of the Saints.* To this houſhold moſt aptly may be adjoyned that which you omit, the houſe of *Criſpus*, concerning whom 'tis ſaid *Acts* 18. 8. *And Criſpus the chiefe ruler of the Synagogue believed on the Lord, with all his houſe, and many of the Corinthians hearing believed, and were baptized.* Where under the tearme *houſhold*, thoſe onely are meant who believed, and thoſe that among the *Corinthians*

were baptized, are said first to heare and believe. "You put *in the* "*houshold of Aristobulus, the houshold of Narcissus*, and you doe allude to *Rom.* 16.10, 11. but these are onely brought in to make a number. For though our translators in the Text, reade *of Aristobulus and Narcissus houshold*, yet in the Greeke it is τὰς ἐκ τῶν Ἀριστοβούλου, & τὰς ἐκ τῶν Ναρκίσσου, which cannot well be translated *of the houshold of Aristobulus and Narcissus*, but rather as *Beza*, *ex familiaribus*, and as our translators in the Margin, *of the friends of Narcissus*; and if it were translated *houshold*, yet proves not that the whole families were Christians, but some of them. "The next you mention, *is the houshold of* "*Lydia, of whom it was said, that shee was baptized, and her houshold*, *Acts* 16.15. But this must be understood by other places, which when they expresse the baptizing of the houshold, they expresse also the believing, or receiving of the Word by the whole houshold, and by the frequent use of the Word, which is to put the house for the people of growth in it; as, *Mat.* 10. 13. *Mark.* 3. 25. & 6. 4. *Luk.* 11.17. *Joh.* 4. 53. *Acts* 10. 2. 2 *Tim.* 4. 19. The last you mention, is *the houshold of the Gaoler*; concerning whom it is said, *that he was baptized*, καὶ οἱ αὐτοῦ πανοικεί. *Act.* 16.33. "I remember M^r *Edwards* at *Christs-Church* "indeavoured lately to gather from this expression, that because it "is said, [*all his were baptized*] therfore his young children or infants, but this is but a light conjecture, and the Text sufficiently refutes this glosse: for *ver.* 32. immediately precedent expresseth who those [*all his*] were, to wit, *all those in his house to whom Paul had spoken the word of the Lord*; and *ver.* 34. immediately subsequent, which saith, *that he rejoyced, believing in God, with all his houshold.* But M^r *William Cooke*, *pag.* 46. hath σόφον φάρμακον, a wise remedy to cure this: he tels us thus, "*I conceive it might be rendered more agreeably to the signification of the* "*words, the scope of the place, and the avoyding of ambiguitie. And ha-* "*ving believed in God, he rejoyced, exulted, or testified his joy openly by* "*words and actions in all his familie, or through his house, or all his house* "*over.* But it is not worth while to refute this conceit at large, it is agreeable enough to the scope, order, meaning and signification of πανοικὶ, *with all his house*, to joyne it with πεπιστευκὼς, *believing*, and to expound it as *Beza*, *cum universa domo, with the whole houfe*, and the Vulgar, *cum omni domo, with all the houfe*, rather then *in domo, in the houfe*, and to make it answer to σὺν παντὶ τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ, *with all his houfe*, Acts 10. 2. to σὺν ὅλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ, *with all his houfe*, Acts 18. 8. so that as yet it doth not appeare that either one infant was baptized, or that

that the Gospel tooke place just as the old administration, by bringing in whole families together. Yea the contrary appeares out of the 1 *Pet.* 3. 1. & 1 *Cor.* 7. 13. 16. that the husband was converted sometimes without the wife, and on the contrary, 1 *Cor.* 7. 21. & 1 *Tim.* 6. 1. *Phil.* 4. 22. in the house of infidel Masters were converted servants, and on the contrary, *Philem.* 11. 12. 14, 15, 16. And our Lord Christ foretold it should be so in the preaching of the Gospel, *Mat.* 10. 35, 36. Wherefore I much marvaile at the speech of Mr *Blake*, *pag.* 22. "*We have examples not to be contemned of the baptizing whole houshold,* "*and whether infants were there or no, as it is not certaine, though proba-* "*ble, so it is not materiall, the president is an houshold*; *He that followeth* "*the president, must baptize houshold*s; *It appeares not that any wife was* "*there, yet he that followes the president in baptizing of houshold*s, *must* "*baptize wives, and so I may say servants, if they be of the houshold.* Which speech, though it containes onely dictates, and might be let passe, yet it is not fit to leave it without some animadversions. For if it be true, that the president is an houshold, and wee must baptize households, I aske whether we must baptize wife and servants, because they professe the faith, or because they be of the houshold: if the first be said, then the president is not of baptizing households, but baptizing a professor of the faith, which is the thing the Antipædobaptists contend for; if because of the houshold, whether professing faith or not, then an unbelieving wife or servant should be baptized, because they are of the houshold, unlesse it be supposed, that in an houshold when the Master or a husband is a believer, the wife and servant cannot be an unbeliever, the contrary whereof hath appeared above: But this I believe, none will deny to be absurd, and heterodox, and consequently that speech of Mr *Blakes* is very absurd, that I say no worse of it. To which I adde, that Mr *Blake* gives no reason, nor I thinke can, why the baptizing of houshold*s*, *Acts* 16. should be the precedent for baptizing rather then the baptizing *Samaria*, *Act.* 8. 12. the 3000. *Acts* 2. 42. all *Judea*, *Mat.* 3. 5. So that in fine, it appeares that *the administration of Baptisme is not just as the administration of circumcision*, and that though it be true, that sometimes houshold*s* were baptized, yet it is said, *those houshold*s *received the Word*, and the word *houshold*, is often put for the browne people of it, and therefore as yet there is no example in Scripture to justifie the baptizing of infants, according to ordinarie rule. As for the objection of the houshold, eating the Passeover, and the answer to it, I shall let it passe now, be-

cauſe it will come againe in the laſt objection of the fourth part of your Sermon. And thus I have at laſt examined your firſt and maine argument. Your ſecond, it ſeemes, you make leſſe account of, and therefore I ſhall ſooner diſpatch the anſwer. Thus you frame it.

§. 15. Of an infants capacity of inward grace; the Text *Mat.* 19. 14. and of the inconſequence of Pædobaptiſme thereon.

"THe *ſecond argument: to whom the inward grace of Baptiſme belongs,* "*to them belongs the outward ſigne, they ought to have the ſigne,* "*who have the thing ſignified, the earthly part of the Sacrament muſt be* "*granted to thoſe who have the heavenly part: but the infants of believers,* "*even while they are infants, are made partakers of the inward grace of* "*Baptiſme, of the heavenly and ſpirituall part, as well as grown men: there-* "*fore they may and ought to receive the outward ſigne of Baptiſme. The* "*major propoſition, that they who are made partakers of the inward grace,* "*may not be debarred of the outward ſigne, is undeniable: it is Peters ar-* "*gument,* Acts 10. *Can any forbid water, that theſe ſhould not be bapti-* "*zed, who have received the holy Ghoſt as well as wee? And againe, for as* "*much as God gave them the like gift, as he did unto us, what was I that I* "*could withſtand God?* And *this is ſo cleare, that the moſt learned of the* "*Anabaptiſts doe readily grant, that if they knew any infant to have recei-* "*ved the inward grace, they durſt not deny them the outward ſigne, and* "*that the particular infants whom Chriſt took up in his armes and bleſſed,* "*might have been baptized.* The Queſtion between us is, whether the infants of believers univerſally, or indifferently, are to be admitted to the Sacrament of Baptiſme, according to ordinary rule. Now I ſuppoſe you doe not hold that the infants of believers indifferently have actually the thing ſignified by Baptiſme, that is, the Holy Ghoſt, union with Chriſt, adoption, forgiveneſſe of ſinnes, regeneration, and everlaſting life: for then they are all ſanctified, and are all believers, and if this could be proved, there would be no queſtion about Pædobaptiſme, the texts, *Act.* 8. 37. *Act.* 10. 47. *Act.* 11. 17. would undeniably prove it, and therefore there is no Antipædobaptiſt, I thinke, but will grant your *Major*; *That regenerate perſons united to Chriſt, whoſe ſins are forgiven, adopted perſons that have received the Holy Ghoſt, are to be baptized.* But I conceive, though in the laying down the *Major*, you uſe theſe phraſes [*who have the thing ſignified, who have the heavenly part*]: and in your *Minor* [*are made partakers*]; yet you do not mean in this Aſſumption, actuall having, and being made partakers of the inward grace of Baptiſm; concerning which, the Antipædobaptiſts do ſo readily grant the *Major:* but a potentiall having,

or,

or, as you after ſpeak, *being capable of the inward grace*; and ſo you uſe the fallacy of equivocation: in the *Major*, [*having*] being underſtood of actuall having, and in the *Minor* of potentiall, which makes four terms, and ſo the Syllogiſme is naught: Or, if you do mean in both actuall having, you mean it only of ſome Infants of Believers, not of all, of whom the Queſtion is, and ſo your concluſion is but particular, that ſome Infants of Believers, who are ſanctified actually, are to be baptized. But this will not reach home to your tenet or practice, concerning the baptizing of all Infants of Believers, in as much as they are the children of Believers, without the conſideration of actuall faith or ſanctification. It is true, the *Lutherans* do teach, that Infants have actuall faith, and are regenerate in Baptiſme, and therefore, *in Colloquio Mompelgartenſi*, upon the fourth *Artic. de Baptiſmo*, they put theſe among the Poſitions they reject, as contrary to the Scripture: *Non omnes infantes qui baptizantur gratiæ Chriſti participes eſſe, & regenerari, infantes carere fide, & nihilominus baptizari; that all the Infants which are baptized, are not partakers of the grace of Chriſt, and regenerate; that Infants want faith, and nevertheleſſe are baptized.* And I remember, when I lived in *Oxford*, there was a book publiſhed in *Engliſh*, of Baptiſmal initiall regeneration of elect Infants, the Poſition whereof was oppoſed, as favouring the doctrine of conferring grace by Baptiſme, *ex opere operato, by the work wrought*, and interciſion of regeneration, ſith according to that doctrine, a perſon might have the Spirit initially, in infancy; and though it could not fall away finally, as being an elect perſon, yet might run out in a continued courſe of ſinning groſſe and ſcandalous ſins with full conſent untill his dying day; which doth enervate the urging of that Text, 1 *John* 3. 9. againſt Apoſtaſie of regenerate perſons, when out of it is proved, that raigning ſin is not in the regenerate, and the like texts, which in that Controverſie are urged againſt *Arminans*. With that book Dr. *Featley* in his late feeble, and paſſionate Tract againſt *Anabaptiſts*, and *Antiprelatiſts* concurs, *pag.* 67. in theſe words: *Nay, ſo farre are they from excluding faith from Infants that are baptized, that they believe, that all the children of the faithfull, who are compriſed in the covenant with their fathers, and are ordained to eternall life, at the very time of their baptiſme receive ſome hidden grace of the Spirit, and the ſeed of faith and holineſſe, which afterwards bears fruit, in ſome ſooner, in ſome later.* And ſince I came to *London*, I met with a Book, intituled, *A Chriſtian plea, for Infants Baptiſme*, by *S. C.* who holds

holds positions somewhat like to the *Lutherans*, *that though children of believing parents be not all holy and righteous, they may degenerate, apostatize, yet the Infants of believing parents are righteous by imputation, are believers and confessors imputatively*, &c. *pag.* 10. and elsewhere. And he hath this passage, *pag.* 3. *It is a sure truth, that the sins of the parents, being forgiven, the Lord will not impute the same unto their Infants. Originall sin, I say, taketh no more hold on the Infants then on their parents; and touching actuall sin, they are as clear as their parents.* Many more like passages there are in that Book, these I mention, that you may see what stuffe Pædobaptists do feed the people with. But I suppose you do not hold, that all Infants of Believers, either actually or initially, or imputatively, are sanctified, regenerated, adopted, justified, as knowing how contrary this is to *Rom.* 9. 6, *&c.* to daily experience, to the doctrine of *Beza* and his Collegues, at *Mompelgart*, to the reformed Churches of *Geneva*, &c. and what advantage it gives to *Papists*, *Lutherans*, *Arminians*, and those that follow the way of *Tomson* in his Diatribe, of which I suppose you are not ignorant; and therefore conceiving you orthodox in this point, the answer to your Syllogisme is either by shewing it doth not conclude the question, if your *Minor* and conclusion be understood of actuall having the inward grace, and they be particular only. If you understand them of actuall having, and they be universall, then I deny your *Minor*. If your *Major* be understood of potentiall having, I deny it, if of actuall, and the *Minor* be of potentiall, there be four terms, and so the Syllogisme is naught. Take away the ambiguity of your terms, and the answer is easie. But for the proof of your *Minor*, you say thus: "*And for the Assumption, or Minor, That the Infants of* "*Believers, even while they are Infants, do receive the inward grace as well* "*as grown men, is as plain, not only by that speech of the Apostle, who saith,* "*they are holy, but our Saviour saith expressly*, Mark 10. *That to such* "*belongs the Kingdome of God, as well as to grown men; And whereas* "*some would evade it, by saying, that the Text saith not, To them belongs* "*the kingdome of God, but of such is the Kingdome of heaven, τοιῶτων, of* "*such like, that is, such as are graced with such like qualities, who are* "*humble and meek, as children are: and that* Luke 18. *is parallel to* "*this in the meaning of it: whosoever doth not receive the Kingdome of* "*heaven as a little child, he shall not enter therein. But I answer, though* "*it be true, that in other places this is one use that Christ makes of an In-* "*fants age and condition, to shew, that such as receive the Kingdome of* "*heaven,*

cc heaven, must be qualified with humility, &c. *like unto children; yet here cc it cannot be his meaning, because his argument is, Suffer them to come to cc me, and forbid them not, because of such is the Kingdome of God,* that *cc is, my Church and Kingdome is made of those, as well as of others. This cc was the very cause, why the disciples rebuked those who brought the chil- cc dren to Christ, because they were little, not fit to be instructed; and there- cc fore not fit that Christ should be troubled about them; this Christ rebukes cc in them, and tels them, that the littlenesse of children, is no argument why cc they should be kept from him: Suffer them, said he, to come, and forbid cc them not, for of such is the Kingdome of God; and what kinde of ar- cc gument had this been, if the Text should be interpreted as these men cc would have it; Suffer little children to come unto me, that I may touch cc them, take them up in mine arms, put my hands upon them, and blesse cc them, because the Kingdome of God belongeth to them, who have such like cc qualities, who resemble children in some select properties? By the very cc same ground, if any had brought doves and sheep to Christ to put his cc hands upon them, and blesse them, the Disciples had been liable to the cc same reproof, because of such is the Kingdome of God, such as are partakers cc of the Kingdome of God, must be endued with such like properties.*

The *Minor* to be proved is, that all the Infants of Believers, or the Infants of Believers in as much as they are Infants of Believers, are actually partakers of the inward grace of Baptisme, else your Argument will not serve for your purpose, as hath been shewed. Now neither doth the Apostles speech, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. prove it, as hath been shewed above; nor doth this Text, *Mar.* 10. 14. prove it. For, first, it is doubtfull, whether these were Infants or no. I presume you are not ignorant, that *Piscator observat:* in *Mat.* 19. 14. doth maintain that the speech of Christ, is not of Infants, but of children which were capable of instruction, which he gathers from this, that Christ called them, *Luke* 18. 16. And whereas it is said in *Mark*, *he took up in his arms*, the word so translated, is used *Mark* 9. 36. For the imbracing of those that were of some growth, whom he placed in the midst, and of whose scandalizing he there warnes; nor doth the word βρέφη used *Luke* 18. 15. translated in *English Infants* prove it, for it signifies a childe capable of teaching, as when it is said, *Timothy* knew the sacred Scripture from a childe, ἀπὸ βρέφους, that is, *ever since he was a boy*, not an Infant; nor doth the word προσφέρειν translated *brought unto him* prove that they were Infants: For the same word is applied to them that were guided, though they were not carried, but

did

did go by themselves, as the blinde and deaf *Dæmoniake*, Matth. 12. 22. and the lunatick childe, *Matth.* 17. 16. To this purpose *Piscator*. As for Mr. *Thomas Goodwins* reason from *Julius Pollux*, "*that the* "*word* βρέφος doth signifie one that is *madidus*, *moist or sappie*, it is of "no force to prove that they were Infants: For besides, that not etymologie, but use must expound words; if it were so, yet we know children are moist, till they be *adolescentes*, youths; we say, till they be of good yeers, they are but a gristle, tender, green; so that notwithstanding this, the children brought to Christ, might be of yeers sufficient to be *catechumeni*, and yet fit enough to resemble humility and harmlesnesse by. Secondly, It is yet doubtfull whether our Saviour said, *of them is the Kingdome of heaven*; for the word is τούτων, *of such*, not τῶν, *of these*: And *Luke* 18. 17. *Mark* 10. 15. both adde this speech, *Verely I say unto you, whosoever doth not receive the Kingdome of God as a little childe, shall not enter therein*; like to which is that *Matth.* 18. 3. But you have two exceptions against this: First, "*because this had been no reason why they should suffer these little children* "*to come to him, because, of such is the Kingdome of God*: Secondly, *he* "*might as well have said, suffer sheep, or doves to come to me*; *for of such* "*is the Kingdome of God*. To these exceptions it may be replied, the reason may be thus conceived; therefore you should not despise that age as prophane, and keep them from me, for even they that are my Disciples, must become children again, in putting off their vices, being converted, unlearning what they have learned, becoming humble and docible, which things could not be resembled by sheep and doves. Thirdly, but let it be granted, that these were Infants, and that τούτων, is to be expounded as *Beza* in his *Annot.* on *Mat.* 19. 14. *horum & similium*, *these and the like*, yet there is no certainty, only conjecture, that they were believers Infants. For, though Christ was in the coasts of *Judea* then, yet it might as well be, that the children were brought by others as parents, and that without faith in Christ, as the Messiah, upon the fame of his miracles, and the conceit he was a prophet, and so they might bring children to him to be blessed, as *Jacob* and *Esau*, by *Isaac*, *Josephs* children by *Jacob*, &c. Fourthly, but let it be granted they were the Infants of Believers,

Grot. annot. *ad.* Mat. 9. 18. *notum erat* Judæis *solere Deum Prophetis hunc exhibere honorem, ut in alios dona sua conferret ad prophetarum preces, quarum symbolum erat manuum impositio. Ad* Mat. 19. 13. *pro pueris etiam eo ritu preces concipi solitas manifestum est ex* Gen. 48. 14, 15. *Exinde* Hebræis *semper observatum, ut ad eos qui sanctimonia præstare cæteris crederentur pueros deferrent, ipsorum precibus Deo commendandos, διὰ τῆς τῶν χειρῶν ἐπιθέσεως: qui mos hodie & apud ipsos manet. Hunc autem morem Christus probans ostendit isti ætati prodesse aliorum fidem ac preces.*

lievers, and that it is said, *of these is the Kingdome of God*, it may be, as *Piscator* observes, referred not to their present estate, as if for the present they were in the kingdome of God, that is, believers and justified; but that they were elect persons, and so in time of them should be the Kingdom of God: Now that which gives right to Baptisme, is the present estate of a person. Fifthly, but let that be also granted, yet all this proves not your *Minor*, unlesse you can prove, that the reason why the Kingdome of heaven belongs to Infants, is common with these to other Infants of Believers, and the reason why theirs is the Kingdome of God, is, because they were the Infants of Believers, that so it may be true of all the Infants of Believers. But this cannot be true, being contrary to expresse Scripture, *Rom.* 9. 6, 7, 8. 13. and inferring this error, that a childe hath right to the Kingdom of God, in that he is the childe of a Believer: And experience proves innumerable of them have no interest in the Kingdome of God. Besides, this reason may be given, why these Infants did belong to Gods Kingdome, because they were such as Christ would blesse, and then all that you can gather from hence will be, that of the Infants of Believers whom Christ blesseth, is the Kingdome of heaven. But this will never prove your Assumption, except you can prove that Christ blesseth all the Infants of Believers. Lastly, Christs action in this businesse is proper to him, as the great Prophet of the Church, and extraordinary, and therefore yeelds no ground for an ordinary rule of baptizing by the publique Ministery. And, if an ordinary rule should be made in imitation of it, it would serve better for the proving the Sacrament of confirmation, which *Art.* 25. of the Church of *England* puts among things, *grown from a corrupt following the Apostles*, then Baptisme. And in all probability, if Christ would have this accident "*to be a rule or precedent for bringing Infants to him by a vi-*"*sible signe in the new Testament*, as Mr. *Thomas Goodwin* at *Bow* dictated, he would have appointed his Apostles to have baptized these Infants as a samplar. For which reason, it seems to me, that this example rather shews Christ would not have Infants baptized, then that he intended to make this accident a precedent for pædobaptisme. But you will prove your *Minor* by reasons, and thus you reason:

"*Beside, what one thing can be named, belonging to the initiation and* "*being of a Christian, whereof Baptisme is a seal, which Infants are not* "*capable of as well as grown men; they are capable of receiving the Holy* "*Ghost, of union with Christ, of adoption, of forgivenesse of sins, of re-*

"*generation, of everlaſting life; all which things are ſignified, and ſealed*
"*in the Sacrament of Baptiſme.* I may apply to you the words of *Horace, Amphora cœpit inſtitui, currente rota cur urceus exit? A barrell began to be made, why the wheel running doth a pitcher come forth?* The thing you ſhould prove is, that all the Infants of Believers, are actually partakers of the inward grace of Baptiſme; but in ſtead of this, you prove, they are capable of it; they may have it, but doth it therefore follow, that they actually have it? It was once an Axiome in the Schools; *à poſſe ad eſſe non valet argumentum, from it may be to it is, an Argument holds not*; and I think it is ſo ſtill. Beſides, muſt children be baptized, becauſe they are capable of Grace? Then may all children be baptized, for they are all capable of the inward Grace of Baptiſme. But you have yet ſomething more to ſay.

"*And it is further conſiderable that in the working of that inward*
"*grace, of which Baptiſme is the ſigne and ſeal, all who partake of that*
"*grace, are but meer patients, and contribute no more to it then a childe*
"*doth to its own begetting, and therefore, Infants as fit ſubjects to have it*
"*wrought in them as grown men; and the moſt grown men are in no more*
"*fitneſſe to receive this grace when it is given them in reſpect either of any*
"*faith or repentance, which they yet have, then a very little childe, it being*
"*the primary intention of the covenant of Grace in its firſt work to ſhew*
"*what free grace can, and will do to miſerable nothing, to cut miſerable man*
"*off from the wild Olive, and graffe him into the true Olive, to take away*
"*the heart of ſtone, to create in them a heart of fleſh, to forgive their ini-*
"*quities, to love them freely; what doth the moſt grown men in any of theſe*
"*more then an Infant may do, being only paſſive in them all? and of this*
"*firſt grace is the Sacrament of Baptiſme properly a ſeal.* That which you ſay, it is true, is further conſiderable; but to what purpoſe it is here brought in, I cannot readily divine, whether it be for a proof of the *Minor* of your Syllogiſme; or that which you ſaid immediatly before, *that Infants are capable of the inward grace of Baptiſme*; or whether you would make a further Argument for Infant-baptiſme thus: Baptiſme is to be given to thoſe that are capable of the firſt grace as well as grown men; and the proof of this ſeems to be, becauſe Baptiſme ſeals properly the firſt grace. But Infants are capable of the firſt grace as well as grown men, and the proof of this ſeems to be, becauſe all who partake of that grace, are but meer patients, *&c.* Therefore Infants are to be baptized as well as grown men. If this be your Argument, the *Major* is to be denyed: For, a perſon is not to be baptized

baptized becauſe he may have grace, but becauſe he hath it. And for the reaſon, *that Baptiſme ſeals properly the firſt grace*, it is obſcure, what you mean by the firſt grace is not cleare. If the free favour of God, mentioned before, when you ſay, [*to love them freely*] this indeed is the firſt grace ſimply Gods eternall love and election; and I deny not but Baptiſme ſeals it in ſome ſenſe properly, and ſo doth the Lords Supper as properly; if you mean by the firſt grace the covenant of Grace, which is the firſt tranſient act of grace, that alſo is ſealed properly in Baptiſme, and as properly in the Lords Supper: if you mean the firſt grace in execution, it is uncertain w^ch you put firſt, juſtification or regeneration, or, as ſome, adoption: And then which is the ſecond grace is uncertain, whether after-ſanctification, cooperating, concomitant, ſubſequent grace, ſuſtentation againſt temptations, remiſſion of ſins, hearing prayers, or eternall glory. Now, I do not well underſtand in what ſenſe, or why Baptiſme ſeals properly rather the firſt grace then the ſecond, ſith according to your doctrine it is a ſeal of the covenant of grace; and therefore of all the promiſes in it; Nor can I tell, why it ſhould be ſaid, that Baptiſme ſeals the firſt grace properly, rather then the Lords Supper. I confeſſe in exactneſſe of ſpeech, Baptiſme ſeals no grace, firſt or ſecond, properly, taking it for propriety of ſpeech, but improperly, becauſe metaphorically, as ſealing is taken for aſſuring. And if properly notes propriety of right, or title, or poſſeſſion in oppoſition to anothers; or that which is alien, I ſee not how Baptiſme doth ſeal, that is, aſſure the firſt grace in reſpect of the propriety of right more then the ſecond, or more then the Lords Supper. And therefore your ſpeech ſeems to me very ambiguous: And for the *Minor*, as I conceive, you frame it, that Infants are capable of the firſt grace as well as grown men, it is true, and ſo they are of the ſecond, or at leaſt ſome of them; but both by extraordinary working. As for receiving grace by ordinary means, they are not capable of one or other. And for the ſpeeches which you heap together, though I grant that in the firſt converſion, in the ſenſe that ſome learned men underſtand it, we are meerly paſſive; yet I doubt whether Dr. *Twiſſe*, and ſuch as have moſt acutely handled the controverſie about the irreſiſtibility of grace in the firſt converſion, will ſubſcribe to thoſe ſpeeches of yours, when you ſay, *all who partake of that grace, are but meer patients, and contribute no more to it, then a childe doth to its own begetting; and therefore Infants as fit ſubjects to have it wrought in them, as*

grown men, and the most grown men are in no more fitnesse to receive this grace when it is given them, in respect either of any faith or repentance which they yet have, then a very little childe. What doth the most grown man in any of these, more then an Infant may do? being only passive in them all. If my memory deceive me not, the Divines of great *Britain* at the Synod of *Dort* in their suffrage, did set down some things which might be done in respect of faith or repentance, when grace is given, by grown men, more then an Infant can do, and so doth in like manner Mr. *Rutherfurd*, *The Triall and Triumph of Faith*, Serm. 14. pag. 109, 110. And though you say, *The most grown men are only passive in them all*, yet Dr. *Twisse* in his *Vindiciæ gratiæ*, lib. 3. errat. 9. Sect. 3. thought this subtilty necessary, that the will in the first conversion, is meerly passive, as the willing of the will is taken formally, as being in the subject; but as it is taken efficiently, it being a vitall act, so it is not meerly passive in the first conversion. And Dr. *Preston* in his acute Exercitation, *De irresistibilitate gratiæ convertentis*, hath these words: *Nos sustinemus voluntatem in primo actu conversionis, partim passivè, partim activè, id est, prius passivè, dein activè se habere, ideoq; cum Deo cooperari*; *We hold the will in the first act of conversion, to be partly passive, partly active, that is, first of all to be passive, then active, and therefore to cooperate with God.* It is true, the acts of taking away the heart of stone, creating a heart of flesh, forgiving iniquity, loving freely, as they are acts of God, a man is neither active nor passive in them, they are not in man as the subject, nor from man as the agent; only we may be said to be passive, or active, in respect of the *terminus*, or effect of them, a new heart, faith, or repentance, produced by them; and in respect of this, in some sense, we are meerly passive, in some, partly active, and partly passive in the first conversion, according to the doctrine of the two learned Doctors forenamed. You conclude this Argument with this speech: "*And who-*
"*ever will deny that Infants are capable of these things, as well as grown*
"*men, must deny that any Infants dying in their infancy, are saved by Christ.*
Concerning which speech, if you mean that Infants are capable of these things as well as grown men simply, in respect of the things, it is true that Infants are capable of them as well as grown men, and he that denies it denies their salvation: But if you mean it in respect of the *modus habendi*, *the manner of having*, then it is not true: for Infants are not capable in the same manner of a new heart, faith and repentance, by hearing, and outward ordinances, as well as grown men.

men. But what is all this to prove your *Minor*, which is not of potentiall having inward grace, which is not denied, but of actuall having? And so still it remains unproved; that all the Infants of Believers, or the Infants of Believers as such are actually partakers of the inward grace of Baptisme.

And thus have I at last, examined the third part of your Sermon, containing your Arguments from Scripture for Pædobaptisme. I proceed now to examine the last part, which followes.

Infant-Baptisme, is a corruption of the Ordinance of BAPTISME.

PART. IIII.

Concerning the Objections against Infant-Baptisme.

§ 1. Of the first objectiō from institution, *Mat.* 28. 19. and the practise of *John Baptist*, and the Apostles,

"AGainst this argument severall things are objected, which I "shall indeavour to remove out of the way: First, it is said, "that although infants are capable of these things, and they "no doubt are wrought by Christ in many infants, yet may not "we baptize them, because according to the Scripture patterne, both of "Christs Command, Mat. 28. in his institution of Baptisme, where this "was injoyned, and John the Baptist, Christs disciples and Apostles, they "alwayes taught, and made them disciples by teaching, before they bapti-"zed any.

It is true, the institution of Christ, *Mat.* 28.19. and the practise of *John Baptist*, and the Apostles, are the great objections against Pædobaptisme; This principle being laid down as a truth avouched against the Papists, by Protestants generally, that it is a sinne of prophaning the Sacraments, when the institution is altered, by substraction, as when the cup is denied to the lay people, or by addition, as when chrisme and spittle, &c. are added to the elements: and by the nonconfor-

conformists of *England*, that it is will-worship to administer the Sacraments any other wayes, by addition of any thing to them, but circumstances, which are alike requisite to civill actions; now the persons to be baptized cannot be conceived a meere alterable circumstance, but to belong necessarily to the administration or worship, as the person baptizing, and as the persons receiving the Lords Supper, and therefore there must be warrant from institution for it, else it is a sinfull invention of man. But neither Christs institution, or *John* the Baptist, or the Apostles practise, doe warrant the baptizing of infants, therefore it is will-worship: that the institution, *Mat.* 28.19. doth not warrant the baptizing of infants, is proved. 1. Because the institution appoints onely disciples of all nations to be baptized; but infants are not such: therefore the institution doth not warrant their Baptisme. The *Major* and *Minor* of this Syllogisme have been made good, *Part.* 3. *Sect.* 13. 2. Because the order Christ appoints is, that teaching or preaching the Gospel, should goe before Baptisme; now the order of Christ, is a rule of administring holy things, as we argue in like manner, 1 *Cor.* 11. 28. The Apostle appoints that a man is first *to examine himselfe*, then *to eate of that bread*; *ergo*, Children are not to have the Lords Supper; so in like manner wee may argue, wee must first teach persons, and then baptize them; therefore children that cannot be taught by us, are not to be baptized; To that which Mr *Edwards* answereth to this argument, that *John is said*, Mark. 1.4. *to baptize and preach*, I oppose the words of *Beza annot. in Mark.* 1.4. *Quod autem Erasmus subjungit Joannem prius baptizâsse, deinde prædicâsse baptismum, ejusmodi est ut ne refutatione quidem videatur indigere. Quid enim? eum diceret Joannes, Pœnitentiam agite, appropinquat enim regnum cœlorum, non docebat quos erat baptizaturus? Imò verò nisi prius docuisset in quem finem baptizaret, quis tandem ad ejus baptismum accessisset? Certè cum sacramenta sint σεσημείωσεις, necesse est ut præeat doctrina quam obsignent.* 3. Because the institution is to baptize *into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit*, that is, with invocation of the name of the Lord, as *Acts* 22. 16. *Paul* is bid *arise and be baptized, and wash away his sinnes, calling on the name of the Lord.* Which infants cannot doe: with devoting themselves to the service and adherence of the Father, Son, and holy Spirit, which may be gathered from this, that *Paul* said, 1 *Cor.* 13.15. *he had baptized none into his name*, that is, he had not caused them in their baptisme to devote or addict themselves to him as their Master, but infants cannot so devote themselves

Cotton in his way of the Churches of Christ in *New-England. Chap* 4. *sect.* 6. *And indeed the Commission which Christ gave his Apostles, holdeth it forth that they were by preaching to make disciples before they baptized them and their children*, Mat. 28.19. *Now a disciple is a Scholler in Christs schoole, and therefore when the Apostles were directed to make disciples, before they did baptize them, they were not onely to cõvert them to the faith, but also to gather them as disciples or schollers into a schoole of Christ.*

to

to Christ, therefore they are not to be baptized according to this institution. 4. Christ bids the Apostles presently after baptisme *teach them to observe what ever he commanded them*; but infants cannot doe this, therefore they are not to be baptized. Likewise baptizing infants, doth not agree with the primitive practise of *John Baptist*, and the Apostles, who required expressions of repentance and faith afore Baptisme, *Mat.* 3. 6. *Mark.* 1. 5. *Luk.* 3. 10. *Acts* 2. 38. & 8. 12, 13. 37. & 9. 18. & 10. 47. & 11. 17, 18. & 16. 15. 31, 32, 33. & 18. 8. & 19. 5. 8. 22. 16. in which places, profession of repentance and faith is still made the antecedent to Baptisme: but this doth not agree to infants, therefore they are not to be baptized. Of these arguments you answer onely to the two first from institution; and to the last from example; to the first from institution, you answered before, and there I examined your answer, *part.* 3. *sect.* 12, 13. To the second from institution, and to the last from example, you make some answer here, not denying that the order appointed by Christ is first to teach, and then to baptize: for that is so manifest, that your selfe *page* 35. doe so paraphrase the words, when you say, *expresse command there is, that they should teach the heathen, and the Jewes, and make them disciples, and then baptize them:* nor by denying that *John Baptist*, and the Apostles required expressions of faith and repentance afore Baptisme, nor by denying that the institution of Christ, and the Apostles example, are our rule in the administring the Sacraments, so as that we cannot vary from them without will-worship, and prophaning the worship of God by our inventions: for that is so confessed a truth, that there hath been a great while, scarce a Sermon before the *Parliament*, but hath asserted that rule, and pressed it on the *Parliament*, and our solemne Covenant supposeth it, the Churches of *Scotland*, *New-England*, &c. The Sermons in the Citie continually avow it, and urge it, and upon this ground former and later reformations are urged. But you have two miserable evasions; You say, I answer. "First, *that of Mat.* 28. *is not the institution of baptisme, it was* "*instituted long before to be the seale of the Covenant, it's only an inlargement of their commission, whereas before they were onely to goe to the* "*lost sheepe of the house of Israel, now they are to goe unto all the world.* Whereunto I reply, 1. If this be not the first institution of baptisme, yet it is an institution, and the institution of baptisme to us Gentiles, and therefore the rule by which Ministers are to baptize, there being no other institution that I know of to regulate our practise by, but such

Cotton: The way of the Churches of Christ in *New-England. Chap.* 1. *sect.* 1. *prop.* 4. *In the times of John the Baptist, such as were received into baptisme they did first make confession of their sins, and therewith of their repentance, and of their faith also in him who was to come after him*, Mat. 3. 13. Act. 19. 4, 5. *And in the times of the Apostles* Philip *received the* Eunuch *unto baptisme, not untill he had made profession of his faith in Christ Jesus*, Acts 8. 37. Cham. Panstr. Cath. tom. 4. l. 5. c. 15. §. 19. *Hi ritus omnes professionis fidei, &c. ab ipsa baptismi institutione habuerunt originem: nec debet omitti, tantum pro aetatis ratione dispensari.*

such as is gathered from *John Baptist*, the Apostles practise and sayings. 2. If institution or appointment of God must warrant our practise in Gods worship, which you once held in the Sermon cited before, *part.* 2. *sect.* 9. then you must shew another institution, else you cannot acquit pædobaptisme from will-worship, and your selfe from *breaking the hedge God hath set about the second Commandement.* But you adde further; "*And beside it is no where said, that none were baptized* "*but such as were first taught, and what reason wee have to believe the con-* "*trary, you have before seene.* Your selfe say presently in the next words, "*It is said indeed, that they taught and baptized, and no expresse mention* "*of any other, then of the baptisme of persons taught, and you assigne a rea-* "*son of it.* And *page* 35. your selfe paraphrase the institution, *Mat.* 28. 19. *Expresse command there is, that they should teach the heathen, and the Jewes, and make them disciples, and then baptize them:* and consequently, there is no expresse command for any other; and for the reason you have to beleeve that others are to be baptized which are not taught, it hath been examined in the weighing your virtuall consequence, which is grounded upon such a principle, as in time you may see to be a dangerous precipice, how ever for the present the great consent of Doctors in the reformed Churches dazzles your eyes; for my part, I cannot yet discerne, but that your grounds for pædobaptisme, are worse then the Papists and Ancients, who build it on *Joh.* 3. 5. *Rom.* 5. 12. But you yet adde. "*Secondly, it is said indeed, that they* "*taught and baptized, and no expresse mention made of any other: but the* "*reason is plaine; there was a new Church to be constituted, all the Jewes* "*who should receive Christ, were to come under another administration:* You say right, therefore none other were to be baptized, but taught persons, because though the invisible Church of the Gentiles were joyned to the invisible of the *Jewes*, *Rom.* 11. 17. *Ephes.* 2. 14, 15, 16. *by faith of the Gospel*, as *Ephes.* 3. 6. it is expounded: yet the outward estate of the Church is new, and as you say, *even the Jewes who should receive Christ, were to come under a new administration*, even those who were *Jewes* by nature and not proselytes, were to be baptized as uncleane persons, contrary to their former administration, in which they were onely circumcised; and this is a plaine evidence, that the administration of Circumcision, is not the administration under which wee are now, but that it did belong to that administration which is now abolished, which is enough to overthrow all your virtuall consequence from circumcision, to baptisme, and consequently all

all the former dispute of your first argument, in which circumcision of infants is indeed the alone prop of baptizing infants. As for that which you adde, "*And their infants were to come in onely in their right.* This overthrows your second argument; for that is grounded upon this, that infants of believers, and particularly infants of believing *Jewes*, such as those are supposed to be *Mark.* 10. 14. were partakers of the inward grace of baptisme, and if so, they came in by their own right. But that one mans right to baptisme, should give another right to baptisme, is a position that the Scripture doth not deliver, and inwraps sundry errors, which I now omit, because it comes in onely upon the by. But you goe on. "*And the heathen nations who were to* "*be converted to Christ, were yet without the covenant of grace, and their* "*children could have no right, untill themselves were brought in, and there-* "*fore no marvaile though both John and Christs disciples and Apostles did* "*teach before they baptized, because then no other were capable of baptisme.* In this perioch, you grant many things which doe yeeld the cause; for, 1. you say, *that both John and Christs disciples and the Apostles did teach before they baptized, because then no other were capable of baptisme*; now by this reason you confesse, 1. that baptizing of infants is not according to *Johns* and Christs disciples and Apostles practise; 2. you say, *then no other were capable of baptisme:* Now this is true, either because then there were no children of believers that might be baptized: but that is absurd, that in all the time of *Johns* and the disciples and Apostles ministery, believers had no children to be baptized, and contrary to the allegation of *Mark.* 10. 14. and other Texts, or because they had no Commission; I cannot conceive how else your speech can be true: But if *John*, the disciples and Apostles had no Commission to baptize infants, neither have we, and so to doe it neither have our Ministers any commission, for we have no other commission to baptize then they had. But you thinke to salve it thus; "*But when once themselves were instructed and baptized, then their chil-* "*dren were capable of it by vertue of the covenant.* Upon which I observe, 1. If the children were capable when once parents were instructed, and baptized, then they were capable, in *Johns*, and the disciples, and Apostles times, and so this speech overthrowes that before, that *then no other but taught persons were capable of baptisme.* 2. When you say, *the children were capable by vertue of the covenant*, it seems you could produce no institution in the new administration, but the institution of circumcision, the validitie of which hath been considered before.

Besides, the covenant being the same at all times, as your Concluſ. 1. holds, the children of believers were as capable in *Johns* time as after. So that your words plainly enterfere. But you put a caſe to be reſolved. "*If any in the Jewiſh Church had received commiſſion to goe and* "*make other Cities proſelytes to them, their commiſſion muſt have run thus,* "*Goe teach and circumciſe, would it therefore have followed, that none* "*might be circumciſed, but ſuch as were firſt taught?* To this I anſwer, in this commiſſion the precept of circumciſing ſhould have had reference in the execution of it, either to the old inſtitution of circumciſion, *Gen.* 17. and then they had been appointed to circumciſe males at eight dayes old not taught, or to a new inſtitution, and then it would have been told more plainly, what they were to circumciſe and whom, and ſo they might have reſolved themſelves. But what this makes for baptiſme of infants, I ſee not, unleſſe it be ſuppoſed that baptiſme and circumciſion are all one, which like the ſtring in the Lampry is an errour that runs along through your whole Sermon.

§. 2. Of the ſecond objection, and therein of the condition prerequiſite to Baptiſme.

"THe next objection you thus expreſſe; *But it is expreſly ſaid, That* "*he that believes and is baptized, ſhall be ſaved; faith in Chriſt is* "*the condition upon which men may be baptized; and this is the moſt com-* "*mon objection among the Anabaptiſts, unbelievers may not be baptized;* "*children are unbelievers, therefore they may not be baptized; wee have,* "*ſay they, cleare evidence that faith is a condition required in thoſe that are* "*to be baptized, no evidence of any other condition that makes them capa-* "*ble of baptiſme. Others of them adde, that under an affirmative command,* "*the negative is to be included, believing is the affirmative, unbelieving* "*is the negative, therefore where believers are commanded to be baptized,* "*unbelievers are forbidden to be baptized: this objection they much glory* "*in, and ſome of them dare all the world to anſwer it.* The objection framed in this later way I own not, and conſequently I may well let paſſe the anſwer; for the truth is, *Mark.* 16. 16. is not a command, but an enuntiation; onely that text, with others, ſpecially that, *Acts* 8. 37. where when the *Eunuch* asked *Philip, What letteth me to be baptized? Philip anſwered, if thou believeſt in the Lord Jeſus with all thy heart thou mayeſt*; and thereby intimated, that faith profeſſed is a prerequiſite to baptiſme, and the defect of it an hindrance, confirme the objection as it is the firſt way formed, which may be further ſtrengthned from the baptiſme of *Lydia*, the Jaylor, *Criſpus*, &c. and is confirmed

firmed in that in the subsequent practise of baptizing a Confession of faith was made by the person baptized, as appeares out of plaine passages in the Ancients, *Justin Martyr*, *Tertullian*, *Cyprian*, and *Augustine*, *lib.* 8. *confes. c.* 2. where speaking of one *Victorinus*, who was to be baptized, *Deniq; ut ventum est ad horam profitendæ fidei, quæ verbis certis, retentisq; memoriter de loco eminentiore in conspectu populi fidelis Romæ reddi solet ab iis qui accessuri sunt ad gratiam tuam, &c. Lastly, when it was come to the houre of professing the faith, which is wont in certaine words, and gotten by heart to be rendered from an higher place in the sight of the faithfull people at Rome by those that shall have accesse to thy grace*; and when it was offered him by the Presbyters, that if he would he might then make his confession more secretly, he refused it and made his confession publiquely, with great acclamation. But this is a thing confessed by you, *pag.* 47. and it is usually answered, "*that this was* "*onely in the baptisme of growne men: but infants might be baptized* "*without such a confession.* I reply, this answer might serve turne, if either by institution or practise primitive, there could be proved any other baptisme then of confessors of faith: in the meane time, till that be done, the argument is good, sith *primum in unoquoq; genere est mensura reliquorum*; *The first in each kinde is the measure of the rest*; and this was a prerequisite condition in the first practise, therefore it ought to be so still, especially considering that God in his providence hath still preserved in all ages an image of the first practise in the interrogatories propounded to the baptized, even to infants, and thought necessary to be answered by some one for them, and the altering of it hath been a great cause of many corruptions in the Church of God, that so men might see what evils have followed the swerving from the rule: and might be directed what is necessary to be reformed. And so I passe to the third (as you call it) objection, which you thus expresse.

Videatur Chamierus Panstr. Cath. tom. 4. *li.* 5. *c.* 15. *Grot. annot. on* Mat. 28. 19.

§. 3. Of the third so called objection, and therein of the knowledge requisite concerning the person to be baptized.

"*But suppose they are capable of the inward grace of baptisme, and that* "*God doth effectually worke in some of the infants of believers, is that* "*sufficient warrant for us to baptize all the infants of beleevers? if wee* "*knew in what infants the Lord did worke, then we might baptize those* "*infants, say some of them: but that he doth not make knowne to us, wee* "*cannot know of any one infant by any ordinary way of knowledge, that they* "*are inwardly baptized with the holy Ghost, and therefore wee may not* "*baptize any of them, but waite to see when and in whom God will worke*

"*the thing signified, and then apply the signe to them.* This that you here put among the objections, is rather an exception to your second argument, grounded on *Act.* 10. 47. & 11. 17. In answer to which it is granted, that those who have the inward grace, meaning it actually, are not to be debarred of baptisme, for then they are believers and disciples: But then it is rightly added, that this can make no ordinary rule for baptizing the infants of believers indifferently; sith there is no certainty that any one infant of a believer, now existent, hath the inward grace of baptisme: and it is certain that all have not, and experience sheweth very many have not when they come to age, nor can it be known who have and who have not, but by extraordinary revelation, which if given, would be sufficient authoritie to baptize those infants, though the ordinary rule be not to baptize infants of believers indifferently. As the extraordinary spirit of *Elijah*, and *Phinehas*, and *Peter*, in killing *Ananias* and *Sapphira*, were sufficient authoritie to them to doe those things which agree not with ordinary rule. And *this I grant to M*r Blake, *that those that are thus intituled through want of an institution, are not to be excluded:* for according to this supposition, in this case, the institution is cleare for them; for they are sanctified persons, and so believers and disciples of Christ, and besides the extraordinary revelation for that end, would be an institution of that particular act. But the thing that he and you would infer from this concession, is that we may then make it an ordinary rule to baptize infants. But that can never be; for *extraordinarium non facit regulam communem, That which is extraordinary, makes not a common rule.* If it did, *James* and *John* might call for fire from heaven, as *Elijah* did; a man in his zeale might kill a wicked man without a legall triall, as did *Phinehas*. But let us heare what reply you make to this concession, you say thus; "*Our knowledge that God* "*hath effectually wrought the thing signified, is not the condition upon* "*which we are to apply the signe, God no where required that wee should* "*know, that they are inwardly and certainly converted, whom we admit to* "*the Sacrament of Baptisme, the Apostles themselves were not required to* "*know this of those whom they baptized, if they were they sinned in bapti-*
"*zing* Simon Magus, Alexander, Hymeneus, Ananias *and* Sapphira, "*with others: wee are indeed to know that they have in them the conditi-*
"*on which must warrant us to administer the signe, not that which makes* "*them possest of the thing signified; fallible conjectures are not to be our* "*rule in administring Sacraments, either to infants or growne men, but a*
"*knowne*

cc knowne rule of the Word, out of which rule wee must be able to make up cc such a judgement, that our administration may be of faith, as well as out cc of charity: In baptizing of grown men, the Apostles and Ministers of cc Christ administred the signe, not because they conjectured, that the parties cc were inwardly sanctified, but because they made that profession of faith cc and holinesse, of which they were sure, that whoever had the thing in cc truth, were received by Christ into inward communion with himself; and cc that whoever thus made it, that Christ would have them received into cc the communion of his Church, though possibly, for want of the inward cc work, they were never received into the inward communion with Jesus cc Christ. Indeed, when such a confession was made, Christian charity, which cc alwayes hopeth the best, and thinketh no evill, bound them to receive cc them, and think of them, and converse with them, as with men in whom cc the inward work was wrought, untill they gave signes to the contrary: cc But this their charity, or charitable conjecture, was not the ground of ad- cc mitting them to the Ordinance, but the profession and confession of the cc party made, according to the Word which they were bound to rest in; yea, cc I greatly question, whether in case Peter or Paul could by the Spirit of re- cc velation, have known that Ananias or Alexander would have proved cc no better then hypocrites, whether they either would, or ought to have re- cc fused them from Baptisme, whilest they made that publique profession and cc confession, upon which others were admitted, who in the event proved no cc better then those were; so that I conclude, not our knowledge of their in- cc ward sanctification is requisite to the admitting of any to Baptisme, but cc our knowledge of the will of Christ, that such, who are in such and such cc a condition should by us be received into the communion of the Church.

To the assertion here delivered, I assent, that not our knowledge, that the person to be baptized hath inward grace, is necessary; but our knowledge of the will of Christ, and the person to be baptized, his having the condition, which is the profession of faith and holiness, is sufficient warrant to baptize him. And I agree, that a judgement of charity, is not that a Minister is to proceed by in this case, but a judgement of faith, as you speak, and of ministeriall prudence: For a Minister in this case is to act as a Steward, who is to deal according to his Lords will, not his own minde, otherwise his own understanding or affection, which are but a Lesbian rule, should be his rule, which would be intolerable. Thus far I agree with you: only whereas in the case by you framed, your resolution inclines to the negative, I rather incline to the affirmative, and conceive they would have

have refuſed them, and that they ought; becauſe I conceive the end of ſuch an extraordinary revelation would be to warne them not to admit ſuch perſons, and ſo equivalent to a prohibition; and in that caſe the baptizing them, would be a plain prophaning the Ordinance, which is not to be given to Dogs and Swine: And I conceive, that which *Chamier* tom. 4. panſtra. Cath. lib. 5. c. 15. Sect. 13. ſpeaks in juſtification of the ſcrutiny heretofore made in examining the competentes ſo ſtrictly, confirms this reſolution. But to keep to the preſent buſineſſe, that which is granted, doth neither prove that upon extraordinary revelation of the preſent inward ſanctification of an Infant, that Infant may not be baptized without ſtaying for its profeſſion: For, though it be true that we are not to ſtay from baptizing them that profeſſe the faith, becauſe we have not a ſpirit of diſcerning to know them to be reall Believers, yet we may, having a ſpirit of diſcerning that an Infant that cannot profeſſe the faith, yet hath true faith, or is inwardly ſanctified, baptize that Infant without ſtaying for his profeſſion, partly, becauſe of the principle uſed by *Peter*, *Acts* 10.47. and partly, becauſe the revelation of the faith of that Infant to that end, doth authorize that act: Nor doth this conceſſion advantage you to prove baptizing of Infants by ordinary rule, which is the thing you and Mr. *Blake* aim at. But your words concerning the knowledge of the will of Chriſt, as the rule of baptizing, rather advantage the Antipædobaptiſts, who know no other rule to baptize by, but the condition you truly propound of profeſſion of faith, and therefore conceive your words a good plea for them.

But you further ſay: "*And in this the rule to direct our knowledge, "is as plain for Infants as for grown men, the rule having been always "this: that grown men, who were ſtrangers from the covenant of God, un- "believers, Pagans, Heathens, ſhould upon their being inſtructed, and up- "on profeſſion of their faith, and promiſe to walk according to the rule of "the covenant, be received and added to the Church, and made partakers "of the ſeal of their entrance, and their Infants to come in with them, "both ſorts upon their admiſſion, to be charitably hoped of, untill they give "ſignes to the contrary, charity being bound from thinking of evill of them, "not bound to conclude certainly of any of them, becauſe they ought to "know, that in all ages all are not Iſrael who are of Iſrael, and that many "are called, but few choſen.*

That the rule for baptizing Infants ſhould be ſo plain, as the rule to direct our knowledge about baptizing grown men, profeſſors of faith,

faith, I wonder you should say it, much more that you should preach and print it; sith your selfe confesse, *pag.* 34. *no expresse command in the new Testament that they should be baptized; no expresse example where children were baptized:* but on the other side, *pag.* 35. you say, *expresse command there is, that they should teach the Heathen, and the Jews, and make them disciples, and then baptize them.* And I hope you do not imagine, that a rule gathered by virtuall consequence is so plain as that which is expresse; it may be as true, but it is not possible it should be so plain. But the truth of that additionall rule of Infants coming in with their parents, hath been examined, and as yet it hath been found to me, neither plain nor true.

§. 4. Of the fourth Objection, & therein of the stipulation of Baptisme.

YOu go on to the fourth Objection: "*But all who enter into* "*covenant, and receive the seal of the covenant, must stipulate for* "*their parts, as well as God doth for his; they must indent with God* "*to perform the Believers part of the covenant, as well as God doth to per-* "*form his part; as even this Text,* 1 Pet. 3. *requires, that Baptisme* "*which saves us, must have the answer of a good conscience to God. Now,* "*although it be granted, that Infants are capable of receiving the first* "*grace, if God be pleased to work it in them, yet what answer of a good* "*conscience can there be from Infants unto God, they having not the use* "*of reason, and not knowing what the covenant means?*

For my part, I own not this objection taken from the generall nature of the covenant, as if it did exclude Infants, or that particular text, 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. For the word used for a Covenant, may be as well translated a Testament; and the Holy Ghost, *Gal.* 3. and *Heb.* 9. doth use it in that notion, and it may be, that covenants of another may be by interpretation of Law, as their covenant; as in the covenant of the *Israelites* with the *Gibeonites*. And for that text, however *Beza* translates ἐπερώτημα, by *stipulation*, and in his *Annotation* on that place sayes, *The Apostle had respect to the interrogations of Catechists, in which the catechised even then did witnesse their inward baptisme to be confirmed by the outward, as* Acts 8. 37. *whereto, sayes he, belongeth the Apostles Creed, and that translated from the baptisme of grown persons to the baptisme of Infants by a greater error, if you consider the Infants themselves: Dost thou believe? I do believe: Dost thou renounce? I do renounce. Whence that of* Tertullian, *which is, as it were, in the stead of a Commentary on this place, in his book of the resurrection of the flesh; The soul is established, not by washing, but by answering.* I say, though *Beza* do upon second thoughts,

Cotton: The way of the Churches of Christ in *New-England*, ch. 4. §. 5. *The Word of God receiveth none to the fellowship of the seals of the covenant, but such as professe their taking hold of the covenant.*

thoughts, and neerer conſideration conceive this to be the meaning, yet I build not on it, as being doubtfull, and in mine apprehenſion, it rather notes an effect of Baptiſme and the reſurrection of Chriſt, then a prerequiſite condition; and there are other plain places before alledged which do prove the thing, that the baptized were to profeſſe and promiſe; or, to uſe your phraſe, ſeal (which I deny not to be the phraſe of *John Baptiſt*, Joh.3.33.) as *Acts* 8.37.&c. So that the objection is the ſame with the ſecond. Now let us ſee what you anſwer: you ſay thus,

"*The Infants of the* Jews *were as much tied as the Infants of Be-*
"*lievers under the Goſpel, every one who was circumciſed, was bound to*
"*keep the whole Law*, Gal. 5. *And theſe men profeſſe that* Iſraelitiſh *In-*
"*fants were within the old covenant, when yet they knew not what it*
"*meant, nor could have the ſame uſe of it with their parents and others*
"*of diſcretion; look what anſwer they will make for the* Jews *Infants*
"*if true, will abundantly ſatisfie for the Infants of Believers under the*
"*Goſpel.*

It is true, this anſwer ſerves turn againſt thoſe that argue from the generall nature of a covenant; but it is no anſwer againſt thoſe that only urge Inſtituton and Apoſtolicall practice as our rule. As for that which you here, and all along in your Book, ſuppoſe that there is the ſame reaſon of the mixt covenant made with *Abraham*, as with the pure Covenant of the Goſpel, and of every Believer, as of *Abraham*, and of Baptiſme, as of Circumciſion, it is the πρῶτον ψεῦδος, *chief error*, which miſleads you throughout your Sermon, and makes you ſpeak and write in a dialect, which in the Scripture is unknown. And for that which you ſay, "*that the Infants of the* Jews *were as*
"*much tied as the Infants of Believers under the Goſpel*; if you mean it of common duties, of Euangelicall obedience, it is true; if you mean it thus (which alone ſerves for your purpoſe) that perſons to be baptized now, are no more tied to make profeſſion of faith before Baptiſme, then Infants of the *Jews* were tied to make profeſſion of faith afore Circumciſion, it is falſe: For, there is now plain Text for the requiring of it before Baptiſme, but not before Circumciſion. But you ſay, "*every one that was circumciſed was bound to keep the whole*
"*Law*, Gal. 5. True, and therefore circumciſion was in the uſe of it diametrally oppoſite to the uſe of Baptiſme. You ſay, "*and theſe*
"*men profeſſe that the Iſraelitiſh Infants were within the old Covenant,*
"*when yet they knew not what it meant, and then ſay, look what anſwer*
"*they*

"*they will make for the* Jews *Infants, if true, will abundantly satisfie* "*for the Infants of Believers under the Gospel.* If you mean this concerning the reason why the *Christians* Infants should not be baptized, though the *Jews* Infants were circumcised, this is a true and satisfactory answer, that God commanded the one, but no where the other; and your self say, *pag.* 84. *Our knowledge of the will of Christ, is that which is the only direction we are to follow.*

But you adde a second answer, which I let passe, because it is but a declaration of your own conceits, "*how you conceive a childe may seal* "*the covenant in his infancy, telling us, that their name is put into the* "*Deed, and that a child may seal, first in infancy, and then after agnize* "*it; and that God is pleased to seal to Infants while they are such, and to* "*accept such a seal as they can give,* without any proof, but only spinning out the *simile* of a seal; as if Gods wayes were like mans wayes, or a *simile* did *quadrare in omnibus, a similitude were even in all things*; only where you say, "*that in the mean time, Jesus Christ, who is the* "*surety of the covenant, and surety of all the covenanters, is pleased to be* "*their surety*; this speech is further to be examined. 'Tis true, *Jesus Christ is the surety of a better Testament,* Heb. 7. 12. *he is the surety of all the covenanters, he doth strike hands, and becomes a surety of the whole covenant, and of every condition in it, take it in the largest sense, and this of all, both on Gods part and ours, as very rightly and excellently* Mr. *Thomas Goodwin* in his Teatise intituled, *Christ set forth.* Sect. 3. Chap. 3. And so like purpose, Mr. *Rutherfurd, The triall and triumph of Faith,* serm. 7. But are any other among men covenanters, but the elect who are purchased by the blood of the everlasting covenant? *Heb.* 13. 20. It is a very inconsiderate boldnesse in you, to make every baptized person, or at least every baptized Infant of a Believer a covenanter, for whom Christ is a surety, and one to whom God seals, when the Scripture makes Christ the surety only for his redeemed ones, as may be gathered out of sundry places in the Epistle to the *Hebrews*; but I doubt not but when you have considered it a little better, you will easily espie your error in these dictates, and therefore I passe on to the next objection.

§. 5. Of the fifth Objection, and therein of the benefit that comes by Infant-Baptisme.

"BUt *what benefit comes to children by such kinde of sealing as* "*this is? it seems then (say they) by your own confession, that this* "*is but a conditionall sealing on Gods part,* viz. *that they own it* "*and*

"*and ratifie it when they come to age; and if they then refuse to stand* "*to it, all is then nullified; were it not therefore better to deferre it to* "*their yeers of discretion, to see whether they will then make it their* "*own voluntary act, yea or no.*

In what sense baptizing may be called sealing, I have above shewed, *Part.* 3. *Sect.* 12. but I cannot allow of this, to say, *that God seals to every one that is baptized.* It is true, that Baptisme is in its nature *a seal of the righteousnesse of faith*, 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. but yet God doth not seal this to every one that is baptized, but only to true believers: For, what is Gods sealing, but the confirming of his promise? But God promiseth righteousnesse only to Believers; therefore he seals only to Believers. As for the sealing by God upon condition persons agnize the covenant, it is but a notion, the Scripture makes not Gods promise in the covenant of Grace conditionall in that sense: For Gods promise is for those he enters into covenant with, *That he will put his Law in their hearts, and in their mindes will write them*, Heb. 10. 16. Nor do I know any but *Corvinus* in his *Examen* of *Moulins* Anatomy, *chap.* 9. *sect.* 6. and the *Arminians*, that do so speak of Gods covenant of Grace, as if it were common to the elect and reprobates, and conditionall in this sense, as if God left it to mens liberty, to whom he had sealed, to agnize or recognize that sealing, or to free themselves, if they please, and so nullifie all; yet so as to afford them a while the favour and priviledge of being in covenant with him, as you speak. I appeal to them who have been conversant in the writings of the *Arminians*, whether these speeches do not symbolize with their language. And therefore this that you make an objection, I look on as a frivolous supposing a *Chimæra*, and then disputing about it: But yet there are some things I shall take notice of in your answer.

Dr. *Twisse*: The doctrine of the Synod of *Dort*, & *Arles*, &c. Part 2. § 3. *p.* 121. *I willingly confesse, that the Sacrament of Baptisme is the seale of the righteousnesse of faith unto us Christians, as Circumcision was unto the Jews*, Rom. 4. *which is as much as to say, that it assures us of the remission of our sins, as many as believe; and I conceive it to be a visible signe of invisible grace, and that not of justification only unto them that believe, but of the grace of regeneration also, but how? not at that instant* collatæ, *but* suo tempore conferendæ, *to wit, when God shall effectually call a man; and it is very strange unto me, that regeneration should go before vocation.* See more to the same purpose in the same Author, *part.* 3 § 6.

"*The question is, What benefit to Infants by such a sealing*: you answer thus: "*This objection lay as strongly against Gods wisedome in re-* "*quiring the* Jews *Infants, even in their infancy thus to seal; and there-* "*fore argues no great wisdome, or modesty in men, who would thus reason* "*with God about his administrations.*

It

It is true, God appointed the male children of *Abrahams* family to be circumcised, and thereby they were bound to keep the whole Law, and it were a sinfull presumption to reason with God about it; and in like manner, if God had appointed Infants to be baptized, it would silence all arguings about it, though we knew not the reason: but how it is to be understood, *that God required the* Jews, *even in their infancy to seal*, I do not well understand; our sealing to God is believing, *Joh.* 3. 33. I do not finde that God required this of the *Jews* Infants in their infancy, nor of our Infants; nor was Circumcision it self the Infants duty, required by God of the Infant, though it were its priviledge, it was the parents duty, *Exod.* 4. 24.

You say, secondly, "*God hath other ends and uses of applying the seal* "*of the covenant to them who are in covenant with him, then their present* "*gain, it's a homage worship, and honour to himself; and it behoves us* "*even in that respect, to fulfill all righteousnesse; when Christ was bap-* "*tized and circumcised, he was as unfit for the Ordinance through his per-* "*fection, as children through their imperfection, being as much above* "*them as children are below them.*

It is true, Baptisme is a worship of God; but Pædobaptisme, for ought yet appears, is but a will-worship. Christs Baptisme, it is true, was of a transcendent nature, as is said before; that children are unfit for the Ordinance, is not to be imputed to their imperfection, but to the defect of Gods appointment; if God did appoint it, there would be no doubt of their fitnesse. But you adde further:

3. I answer, "*The benefit and fruit of it at the present, is very much,* "*both to the parents and to the children: to the parents, first, whilest God* "*doth thereby honour them, to have their children counted to his Church,* "*to his Kingdome and Family, and to be under his wing and grace, whilest* "*all the other Infants in the world have their visible standing under the* "*prince, and in the kingdome of darknesse, and consequently, whilest others* "*have no hope of their childrens spirituall welfare, untill they be called out* "*of that condition, these need not have any doubt of their childrens welfare,* "*if they die in their infancy; nor if they live untill they shew signes to the* "*contrary; God having both reckoned them unto his people, and given them* "*all the means of salvation which an Infants age is capable of.* All this passage is but dictates; what, or how much of it is true or false, hath been considered before, only that you say; "*all the other Infants of* "*the world have their visible standing under the prince, and in the king-* "*dome of darknesse; and consequently, whilest others have no hope of their*

"*childrens ſpirituall welfare, untill they be called out of that condition*; If you mean by *all other Infants*, all that are unbaptized, though the Infants of Believers in the Church, it is a very harſh and uncharitable ſpeech; and you oppoſe thoſe that in diſpute againſt the *Papiſts* concerning the neceſſity of Baptiſme to ſalvation, do hold that Infants of Believers are holy, and in the Church afore they be baptized, and joyn with *Lutherans* and *Papiſts*, denying it; if you mean only the unbaptized Infants of *Infidels*, what comfort do you give more to believing parents, that have their children baptized, then belongs to them, though their children were not baptized? And when you ſay, "*that all others have no hope of their childrens ſpirituall* "*welfare*, if you mean it of believing parents that baptize not their children, it is in like manner an uncharitable ſpeech, and doth border too neer on the opinion of the neceſſity of Baptiſme for Infants to ſalvation; and when you ſay, "*theſe need not have any doubt of their chil-* "*drens welfare, if they die in their infancy*, if you mean it of parents, becauſe their children are baptized, you do ſpeak like one that did hold that Baptiſme doth *conferre gratiam ex opere operato, conferre grace by the work done*; but for ought you can ſhew out of Scripture, a believing parent hath as much ground of hope for his Infant that dies unbaptized as for the baptized, and as much reaſon of doubt concerning the baptized as the unbaptized. And therefore, what you here ſpeak, doth no whit encourage parents to baptize children, if it be well weighed, except there can be proved an inſtitution and a promiſe. But you ſay, ſecondly, "*here is much priviledge and benefit to* "*the children, when as (beſide what inward ſecret work God is pleaſed* "*to work in them) they being members of the Church of Chriſt, have* "*their ſhare in the communion of Saints, are remembred at the Throne of* "*grace every day by thoſe that pray for the welfare of the Church, and parti-* "*cularly, in thoſe prayers which are made for his bleſſing upon his Or-* "*dinances.*

By your parentheſis, you intimate *ſome inward ſecret work God is pleaſed to work in the Infants baptized, by Baptiſme.* If you conceive a beſtowing of grace, *ex opere operato, by the work done:* or, baptiſmall initiall regeneration of the elect, ſuppoſed to be in the Infants in baptiſme, notwithſtanding till death they live wickedly, ſpeak plainly that we may know what you mean, and then an anſwer may be framed to your ſpeech. As for *being members of the Church*, if you mean the inviſible Church, neither I nor you can affirm or deny; its in Gods

Gods bosome alone; if you mean the visible, you must make a new definition of the visible Church afore Infants baptized will be proved members. For *their remembring at the Throne of grace daily*, if you mean it particularly, and by name, I do not finde that to be in use after Baptisme any more then afore, and I think they are remembred by the godly in generall as well afore Baptisme as after; and for the *praying for Gods blessing upon his Ordinances*, if Infant-baptisme be not Gods Ordinance, this prayer in reference to Infant-baptisme at that time might be better spared. "You say; *And lastly, it's no small privi-* "*ledge to have that seale bestowed on them in their infancy, which* "*may afterwards plead when they are growne, and come to fulfill the con-* "*dition.*

When, where, and how Baptisme should be pleaded, as you shew not, neither doe I well conceive. It is not Baptisme of it selfe that will yeeld a plea of any force, either *in foro soli, in the Court of earth*, or *in foro poli, in the Court of heaven*, but the promise of God, and the condition of faith in Christ. And these will be good pleas in prayers to God, and in the court of conscience, when Infant-baptisme will stand in no stead. The plea of the Apostle will hold, *Rom.* 8. 31, 32, 33, 34. which baptisme rightly administred doth strengthen, 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. But I never knew any Saint that pleaded his infant-baptisme in such cases.

§. 6. Of the sixth objection, and therein of Infant-cōmunion, by vertue of their being in the Covenant, & the Lords Supper succeeding the Passeover.

"YOu say further; *But if their being capable of the spirituall part,* "*must intitle them to the outward signe, why then doe we not also ad-* "*mit them to the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, which is the seale of the* "*Covenant of grace, as well as the Sacrament of Baptisme? And this is ur-* "*ged the rather, because (say they) the infants of the Jewes did eate of the* "*Passeover as well as were circumcised; Now if our infants have every way* "*as large a priviledge as the infants of the Jewes had, then can we not de-* "*ny them the same priviledge which their infants had; and consequently* "*they must partake of the one Sacrament as well as the other.*

This argument is good, *ad homines*, against the partie opposite, proceeding upon the Pædobaptists hypotheses or suppositions; to wit, 1. *That those to whom the Covenant belongs, to them the seale belongs*; 2. *That to the infants of believers, the Covenant belongs*; 3. *That the Lords Supper is a seale of the Covenant as well as Baptisme.* And these are your hypotheses. Now then if this be a good argument, children are to be baptized, because they are in the Covenant, and the seale belongs to those

thoſe in Covenant, by the ſame reaſon they are to receive the Lords Supper, becauſe they are in Covenant, and the ſeale belongs to thoſe in Covenant. Now this argument is ſtrengthened from other hypotheſes, as that the Lords Supper ſucceeds the Paſſeover, as Baptiſme Circumciſion, but children not of yeares of diſcretion had the Paſſeover, therefore they are to have the Lords Supper. And this is confirmed by the practiſe and opinion of the Ancients that gave the Lords Supper to infants, for 600 yeares after Chriſt as well as baptiſme. To this you ſay;

"*I anſwer, that infants are capable of the grace of Baptiſme we are ſure,*
"*not ſure that they are capable of the grace ſigned and ſealed in the Sa-*
"*crament of the Lords Supper.*

This anſwer ſuppoſeth that there is grace ſealed in the Lords Supper, which is not ſealed in Baptiſme. To me that Sacrament that confirmes the covenant of grace, confirmes all the promiſes in it, and therefore if Baptiſme be the ſeale of the covenant, it ſeales all the graces and all the promiſes in it, and therefore you are as ſure that infants are capable of all graces annexed to the Covenant, as of one. But you ſay; "*For both of them are ſeales of the new Covenant, yet it is*
"*with ſome difference; Baptiſme properly ſeales the entrance into it, the*
"*Lords Supper properly the growth, nouriſhment, and augmentation of it;*
"*Baptiſme for our birth, the Lords Supper for our food. Now infants may*
"*be borne againe while they are infants, have their originall ſin pardoned,*
"*be united to Chriſt, have his image ſtampt upon them; but concerning the*
"*exerciſe of theſe graces and the augmentation of them in infants while*
"*they are infants, the Scripture is altogether ſilent.*

You ſpake ſomewhat to like purpoſe before, which I examined *part.* 3. *ſect.* 15. To me it is yet as a paradoxe, that *Baptiſme ſeales properly the entrance into the Covenant, and the Lords Supper, the growth, nouriſhment, and augmentation of it.* If you make the entrance at remiſſion of ſins, juſtification, or mortification; the Lords Supper that ſeales Chriſts death, ſeales the entrance into the Covenant, *Mat.* 26. 28. And for Baptiſme, it ſeales dying with Chriſt, and riſing with Chriſt, *Rom.* 6. 3, 4, 5. *Gal.* 3. 27. *Col.* 2. 12. 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. and therefore not onely the firſt worke of converſion, but alſo after-growth and exerciſe of holineſſe. And the Lords Supper, ſignifies the ſame receiving the Spirit, which Baptiſme doth, 1 *Cor.* 12. 13. And according to the doctrine of Proteſtants, Baptiſme ſeales as well the pardon of other ſins, as of originall ſin. And ſo *Peter*, Acts 2. 38. and *Ananias*,

Act. 22.

*Act.*22.16. And therefore this difference you put, is a difference which the Scripture makes not; that I say nothing of your strange phraseology of the growth, nourishment, and augmentation of the Covenant. But you say;

cc *And what is said concerning the infants of the Jewes eating the Passe-*
cc *over, to which our Sacrament of the Lords Supper doth succeed, there is no*
cc *such thing mentioned in the Book of God. It is said indeed that the seve-*
cc *rall families were to eate their Lambe, if the household were not too little*
cc *for it, and that when their children should aske them what that service*
cc *meant, they should instruct them about the meaning of it, but no word in-*
cc *joyning, nor any example witnessing that their little children did eate*
cc *of it.*

The Commands were, that *all the males should thrice a yeare appeare before the Lord*; one of which was the Passeover, *Exod.* 23. 17. *Exod.* 34. 23. *Deut.* 16. 16. And at that time there was no other food to be eaten, but the unleavened bread, and the paschall Supper. Therefore those males that could eate, though not come to yeares of discretion fit to receive the Lords Supper, yet were to eate the Passeover. *Ainsworth* notes on *Exod.* 12. 26. *So both the outward rite, and the meaning of it was to be taught to their children. Touching whom, the Jewes hold from the Law in* Exod. 23. 14. 17. Deut. 16. 14. *that every child that could hold his Father by the hand, and goe up from Jerusalem (gates) to the mountaine of the Temple, his Father was bound to cause him to goe up and appeare before God with him, to the end he might catechize him in the Commandements. And who so was bound to appeare, was bound to keep the feast. Maimony in Hagigah, Chap. 2. sect. 3, 4. Also they say. A childe that is able to eate a morsell of bread, they catechize him in the Commandements, and give him to eate so much as an Olive of the unleavened bread. Maimony Treatise of leaven and unleavened bread, c. 6. sect.* 10. But you say;

Cotton: The way of the Churches of Christ in *New-England. Chap.* 1. *sect.* 2. *To the Passeover all Jewes were admitted young and old, unlesse defiled with some pollution.*

cc *If they say as some of them doe, that those little ones who were able to*
cc *enquire concerning the meaning of that service, and capable to receive*
cc *instruction about it, did eate of the Passeover with their parents; I answer,*
cc *(although the Scripture speaks nothing of their eating, yet if that be gran-*
cc *ted) it is no prejudice to us, because the Gospel prohibites not such young*
cc *ones from the Lords Supper, who are able to examine themselves and dis-*
cc *cerne the Lords body.*

True; but children that were to appeare at the Passeover, and to partake of it, were many of them such as might be instructed concerning the meaning of that service, and yet too young to examine them-

themſelves, or to diſcerne the Lords body: ſo that if the Lords Supper ſucceed the Paſſeover, and a rule may be drawne from the Paſſeover to the Lords Supper, children unable to examine themſelves, may be admitted to the Lords Supper.

§. 7. Of the firſt uſe, and the Anabaptiſts ſuppoſed bloudy ſentence.

THe reſt of your Sermon is application, which being not argumentative, I ſhall let it paſſe. "Onely whereas you charge *Anabaptiſts with a raſh and bloudy ſentence, condemning infants as out of the "ſtate of grace, condemning all the infants of the whole Church of Chriſt, "as having nothing to doe with the Covenant of grace*; and then tragically aggravate this thing, *as parallel, or rather exceeding the cruelty of* Herod *and* Hazael, *in ſlaying and daſhing the infants of Iſrael againſt "the wall*, till you produce ſome teſtimonies of thoſe you call *Anabaptiſts*, ſo determining, I ſhall take it to be but a falſe accuſation, and a fruit of paſſion, not of holy zeale. For the thing it ſelfe I have ſhewed *part. 2. ſect.* 10. that it doth not follow on the doctrine of Antipædobaptiſme: and I conceive that if to be in the Covenant of grace be rightly explained, to wit, ſo as to ſignifie the having of the promiſe of juſtification and ſalvation by Chriſt Jeſus, (beſides which I know not any other Evangelicall Covenant of grace) your ſelfe will be found to exclude them from the covenant of grace as much as they. As they dare not ſay that this or that particular infant of a believer is in the covenant of grace, that is, certainly elected, juſtified, and to be ſaved, ſo neither dare you. Your owne words are *pag.* 48. "*Charitie being not tyed to conclude certainly of any of them: becauſe they "ought to know that all are not Iſrael who are of Iſrael, and that many are "called, but few are choſen.* If you ſhould, you would gainſay the Apoſtle, *Rom.* 9. 6,7, 8. And on the other ſide, as you will not ſay they are damned, ſo neither will they I am perſwaded: but ſuſpending any ſentence concerning this or that in particular, leave them to God, who is the ſoveraigne Lord both of them and us.

§. 8. The Epilogue containing ſome expreſſions and motions of the Author.

THus have I, at laſt, in the middeſt of many wants, diſtractions, diſcouragements, and temptations, with the aſſiſtence of God, who hath never failed me (to him be the praiſe) examined your Sermon, and thereby ſhewed that it doth not ſatisfie, and how little reaſon you had to ſay in your Epiſtle, *I am aſſured that it is Gods truth which I have preached, and which he will bleſſe.* Notwithſtanding which confidence, I preſume you will ſee cauſe to conſider more exactly of this

this matter upon the reading of this answer. I dare not thinke any otherwise of you then as of one who loves and seekes the truth. Nor doe I know any reason why you should conceive that I have taken this paines for any ends crosse to the finding of truth. My reall intention in this worke is to discover truth, and to doe what is meete for mee in my calling, towards the reformation of these Churches according to Gods Word: unto which wee have both bound our selves by solemne Covenant. I have endeavoured not to let passe any thing of weight, either in your Sermon, or Master *Thomas Goodwins*, which I could well remember, or Master *Blakes*, or any other that have published any thing about this matter of late. It is an endlesse businesse to make a severall answer to every one. I chose to answer yours, because you are stiled the *antesignanus*, *Ensigne-bearer* in print; and for other reasons given in the Prologue. My motion is that there may be an agreement among those that have appeared in publique in this cause, to joyne either in a reply to this examen of your Sermon, or in some other worke, in which I may see together the whole strength embattailed, and not be put to weary out my selfe in reading every Pamphlet, of which there are too many indigested ones now adayes printed, even with License: and for the buying of which, as now my estate is, I doubt whether my purse will furnish me. If I may have ἄρτον ἐπιούσιον, daily bread for mee and mine in a narrow compasse, it will be as much as I may looke for. The small stipend I had is likely to be even now subtracted. If there be any willingnesse in you to have any conference with mee, to consult about a way of brotherly and peaceable ventilating this point, I shall be ready upon notice to give you the meeting, and I hope it shall appeare, that I shall not be ἰσχυγνώμων, stiffe in opinion, in case truth shining before me, present my errour to my view; and I hope the like of you. I shall waite a moneth after your receiving this writing, to know whether any of these motions take place with you, hoping you will not disdaine to let me have advertisement of your minde, by some letter or message. I would faine have truth and peace and love, goe hand in hand, if it may be: though of these three ὅσιον προὔμαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν, it is meet to preferre truth, as *Aristotle* said long since. It will be no griefe of heart to you at the day of resignation of your spirit, that you have done nothing against the truth, but for the truth. You have now my wri-

Mr *Stalians* Epistle before a Conference at *Terling* in *Essex*.

ting, as I have yours: one day Jesus Christ shall judge us both. Consider what I say, and the Lord give you understanding in all things. Thus prayeth

From the house belonging to the Rectory of *Gabriel Fanchurch* in *London*. *December* 7. 1644. Delivered to him *Dec.*9.1644.

Your brother and fellow-servant in the worke of Christ,

JOHN TOMBES.

Inscribed thus;

To the reverend and worthy Mr *Stephen Marshall*, B. D. these present.

As it is now printed, it is enlarged in sundry places, occasioned by sundry Books published since the first writing of it.

Colossians

Coloßians 2. 11, 12.

Proves not Infant-Baptiſme.

An *Appendix* to theſe *Treatiſes*, in an *Anſwer* to a Paper, framing an *Argument* for Infant-Baptiſme, from *Coloſſ.* 2. 11, 12.

SIR,

YOUR Paper exhibites an Argument for Infant-Baptiſme in this form: "*That may be ſaid to be written, without which, that which is written cannot be true.* This I grant. *But that which is ſaid,* Coloſ. 2. 11, 12. *of the compleatneſſe, with reſpect to Ordinances in the new Teſtament, could not be true, unleſſe Baptiſme were to Believers children, as Circumciſion was of old; becauſe it cannot be underſtood of the compleatneſſe that Believers have in Chriſt for ſalvation; for that the* Jews *had in Chriſt in the old Teſtament; but yet they had a token of the Covenant to their children*; Ergo, *ſo they muſt now, or elſe that cannot be true.*

Anſw. This Argument ſuppoſeth ſundry things, whereof ſomewhat is true, ſomewhat falſe.

1. It is true, *That the believing* Jews *were compleat in Chriſt for ſalvation.* For ſo was *David*, *Abraham*, &c. who were juſtified by faith, *Rom.* 4. *Gal.* 3. *Heb.* 11.

2. It ſuppoſeth, *that the Apoſtle,* Coloſ. 2. 11, 12. *mentions Baptiſme, to ſhew that we are as compleat as the* Jews *in reſpect of outward Ordinances,* whereas the Apoſtle ſpeaks not, *verſ.* 10. of compleatneſſe by reaſon of outward ordinances, but ſayes, we are compleat in Chriſt without outward ordinances, and that is his very Argument to diſſwade them from embracing the Jewiſh ordinances, *verſ.* 8. yea, it is plain, that the Apoſtle makes the *Jews* incompleat by reaſon of their outward ordinances; and that it is our compleatneſſe that we have all in Chriſt, without outward ordinances, *verſ.* 17. Nor doth the Apoſtle mention Baptiſme, to ſhew that we are equall to the *Jews* in outward ordinances, (for the Apoſtles aſſertion is, that we are compleat in Chriſt, exhibited without outward ordinances, and ſo the better for want of them) but to ſhew how we put on Chriſt, and ſo are compleat in him, and therefore he mentions Faith as well as Baptiſme; as in like manner he doth, *Gal.*3.26,27. *Rom.* 6. 3, &c. Beſides, if that by being baptized we are compleat in outward ordinances, then we need no other ordinance, and conſequently the Lords Supper ſhould be needleſſe.

3. It is ſuppoſed, *that Circumciſion was a token of the Covenant to their children.* But this is ambiguous, in ſome ſenſe it is true, in ſome ſenſe it is not true. It was a token of the Covenant made to *Abraham,* to wit, Firſt, that God made ſuch a Covenant with *Abraham.* Secondly, that God required them to keep the conditions of it. But it is not true in theſe ſenſes. Firſt, that every perſon circumciſed, or to be circumciſed, of right had a title to the promiſes of the Covenant. Secondly, that this title to the promiſes of the Covenant was the reaſon why they were circumciſed.

4. It is ſuppoſed, *that if our children have not a token of the Covenant now, as the* Jews *had, that it cannot be true that we are compleat as the* Jews. But there is not a ſhadow of proof for it in the Text. And it is grounded on theſe falſe aſſertions: Firſt, that the *Jews* children were in the Covenant of Grace, becauſe they were *Abrahams* naturall ſeed. Secondly, that a Believers children now are in the Covenant of Grace, becauſe they are a Believers children; which things are expreſly contrary to *Rom.* 9. 6, 7, 8.

5. It is ſuppoſed, *that the* Jews *having ſalvation by Chriſt, had alſo a compleatneſſe by outward ordinances.* It is true, that compared with the *Gentiles* that ſerved dumb Idols, they were compleat by reaſon of

of outward ordinances: For, their outward ordinances did shadow Christ to come, and so did not the Rites of the *Gentiles*. But compared with Christians since Christ manifested in the flesh, so they were incompleat in respect of outward ordinances; and so the Apostle determines, *Gal.* 4. 1, 2, 3.

6. It is supposed, *that without a succession of some ordinance in stead of Circumcision, we are not compleat in Christ, or, at least, not so compleat as the* Jews. But this I account to be false, and very dangerous.

1. False, because it is contrary to that which the Apostle asserts, that we are compleat in Christ alone, because in him is the fulnesse of all that was shadowed in the ordinances of the *Jews*.

2. It is very dangerous, because the same reason that will conclude, that we are not compleat without a succession of some ordinance in stead of Circumcision, will conclude, we are not compleat without a succession of something in stead of sacrifices, Temple, Priest, Altar, *&c.* and so after the Popish manner, all Jewish Rites may be reduced under new names, which would overthrow Christianitie.

As for our compleatnesse in Christ without outward ordinances, like to the *Jewes*, I distinguish of a twofold compleatnesse.

First, in all the will of God, *Colos.* 4. 12. And thus we are compleat without such ordinances: we may do all the will of God believing in Christ, without observing any of those ordinances.

Secondly, of means, *in ordine ad finem, in order to the end*, that is, to the knowledge of God, and obtaining salvation: And so we are more compleat then the *Jews* without those outward ordinances or any answerable to them.

First, because they had Christ only promised and assured, we have Christ exhibited, and fulfilling all things. And surely they that have a promise accomplished, are compleater then they that have it only assured, let it be assured never so firmly.

Secondly, because they had Christ under shadows, we the body, *Colos.* 2. 17. he is the true *Shecinah*, or *Divine Majesty*, in whom the fulnesse of the glory of God dwelt, *Col.* 2. 9. he was circumcision, sacrifices, all. And the woman is more compleat that enjoyes her husband in person, then in a picture, messenger, *&c.* that represent him. The *Jews* were compleat in Christ as we, *quoad rem, in respect of the thing*, but not *quoad modum, & mensuram rei, in respect*

of

of the manner and meaſure thereof. So that in the Argument, theſe Propoſitions are to be denied:

1. That *Coloſ.* 2. 11, 12. ſpeaks of compleatneſſe, with reſpect to Ordinances in the new Teſtament.

2. That it could not be true, unleſſe Baptiſme were to Believers children, as Circumciſion was of old.

3. That *Coloſ.* 2. 11, 12. cannot be underſtood of the compleatneſſe that Believers have in Chriſt for ſalvation.

4. In ſome ſenſe it is to be denied that the *Jews* had a token of the Covenant to their children.

5. In what ſenſe it is to be granted that the *Jews* had a token of the Covenant to their children, in that ſenſe the conſequence is to be denied, that we muſt have a token of the Covenant of Grace for our children now.

FINIS.

Latin passages Englished in the second Treatise.

PArt 1. pag. 2. Achilles *the champion of the Greeks proverbially put for the strongest argument.*

Pag. 5. *Christ came to save by himself all; all, I say, who by him are born again unto God, infants, and little ones, and boyes.*

Pag. 6. *That Baptisme is understood under the name of new-birth in our Lords and the Apostles phrase.*

openly confirming the Apostolique tradition of the baptisme of little infants against Anabaptisticall impiety.

Onely I would have the younger who shall light on the works of Irenæus *admonished, that they beware of those editions, which that most impudent Monke* Feuardentius *a man of large boldnesse, and of no faith, hath foully corrupted in many things, and besprattered with impious and lying annotations.*

Are born again.

Therefore being a master he had also the age of a master, not rejecting nor going beyond a man, nor loosing the law of humane kind in himself, but sanctifying every age by that likenesse which was to him. For he came to save all men by himself; all men, I say, who by him are new born unto God, infants and little ones, and boyes, and young men, and elder men. Therefore he went through every age, and was made an infant sanctifying infants; among little ones, a little one, sanctifying them that have this age: being also made an example to them of piety, and justice, and subjection. Among young men being made an example to young men, and sanctifying them to the Lord: so also an elder to the elder, that he might be a perfect master not onely according to the exposition of the truth, but also according to age sanctifying also the elder, being made also an example to them. And then he went even unto death, that he might be the first-born from the dead holding the primacy in all things, the Prince of life, before all, and preceding all.

Pag. 7. *But we shall the lesse trouble our selves concerning* Origen, *because the things we cited are not extant in Greek.*

In the margin. If therefore any man before Pelagius *was born, or before* Arius *arose, be sharp and vehement against the errours of Pelagians, and vexing them professedly, although the name of the heretiques be suppressed, it is not probable that such a writing is the Authors whose name it bears.*

Pag. 8. *For this alſo the Church hath received a tradition from the Apoſtles, and according to the obſervance of the Church.*
The ſeal to them that enter into a courſe of life.

In the margin. Notwithſtanding the cuſtome of our mother the Church in baptizing little ones is not to be deſpiſed, nor by any means to be accounted ſuperfluous, nor at all to be beleeved, unleſſe it had been an Apoſtolicall tradition.

Pag. 11. *That infants are preſently to be baptized that they periſh not, becauſe mercy is not to be denyed them.*

Pag. 13. *Leſt little ones ſhould periſh if they ſhould die without the remedie of the grace of regeneration, they determined that they were to be baptized for the remiſſion of ſins. Which alſo St.* Auguſtine *ſhews in his book of the baptiſme of little ones, and the African Councels witneſſe, and many documents of other Fathers.*
But the father or mother ought not to ſtand for their own childe at the Font, that there may be a difference between ſpirituall begetting and carnall. But if it happen by chance they ſhall have after that no fellowſhip of carnall copulation, who have undertaken the ſpirituall bond of cofatherhood in a common ſon.
What ſay you to theſe things? Lo I have not brought out of Auguſtine, *but out of the Goſpel, which ſith ye ſay ye chiefly beleeve, either yeeld ye at length that by the faith of others others may be ſaved; or deny if ye can thoſe things which I have laid down to be of the Goſpel.*

Pag. 14. *in the margin. And I was ſigned with the ſigne of his croſſe, and I was ſeaſoned with his ſalt from the wombe of my mother, who much hoped in thee.*

Pag. 15. *in the margin.* Auguſtine *adjudgeth to eternall flames the Infants that die without baptiſme. Likewiſe whoſoever ſhall ſay, that even the little ones ſhall be made alive in Chriſt, who go out of this life without the participation of his Sacrament, he truly goeth both againſt the Apoſtles preaching, and condemns the whole Church.*
The moſt ſtrong and founded faith, in which the Church of Chriſt beleeves that no not little ones moſt lately born can be freed from damnation, unleſſe by the grace of the name of Chriſt, which he hath commended in his Sacraments.

Pag. 16. *Neither let that move thee, that ſome do not bring little ones to receive baptiſme with that faith that they may be regenerated by ſpirituall grace unto life eternall: but becauſe they think that by this remedy they keep or receive temporall health. For not therefore are they not regenerate,*

nerate, because they are not offered by them with this intention. For necessarie ministeries are celebrated by them.

It is answered he doth beleeve by reason of the Sacrament of faith.

Pag. 18. *in the margin. Lastly, who seeth not that this was the manner of that time, when scarce the thousandth person was baptized afore he was of grown age, and diligently exercised among the catechized.*

Part. 2.

Pag. 21. *These to the rest of the errours which they borrowed from the Manichees and Priscillianists added this over and above, that they said, that the baptisme of little ones was unprofitable, inasmuch as it could profit none, who could not both himself beleeve, and by himself ask the Sacrament of baptisme, of which kind we read not that the Manichees and Priscillianists taught any thing.*

They mock us because we baptize infants, because we pray for the dead, because we ask the suffrages of the Saints.

They beleeve not that Purgatory fire remains after death, but that the soul loosed from the body doth presently passe either to rest, or to damnation.

But now they who acknowledge not the Church, it is no marvell if they detract from the orders of the Church, if they receive not their appointments, if they despise Sacraments, if they obey not commands.

Because he took away Festivals, Sacraments, Temples, Priests, because the life of Christ is shut up from the little ones of Christians, while the grace of baptisme is denied, nor are they suffered to draw neer to salvation.

Pag. 23. *We perceive in the man dexterity, and a study of mediocrity. But in that man (I desire to be deceived) I have seemed to my self to have found nothing but immoderate thirst of wealth and glory.*

A fanatique man, and grosse Anabaptist.

Pag. 24. *They would seem studious of truth.*

Pag. 25. *The word of the* Lord.

From the staffe to the corner. A proverbiall speech in Schools, when one thing is inferred from another, which have no connexion.

They who all along these places of Belgick and lower Germany are found bordering on this Anabaptisticall heresie, are almost all followers of this Mennon whom I have named, to whom now this Theodorick *hath succeeded. In whom for a great part you may perceive tokens of a certain godly mind, who being incited by a certain unskilfull zeal, out of errour rather then malice of mind have departed from the true sense of Divine*

Scriptures, and the agreeing conſent of the whole Church; which may be perceived by this, that they alwayes reſiſted the rage of Munſter, *and* Batenburgick *that followed after, ſtirred up by* John Batenburg *after the taking of* Munſter, *who plotted a certain new reſtitution of the kingdom of Chriſt, which ſhould be placed in the deſtruction of the wicked by outward force. And they taught that the inſtauration and propagation of the kingdom of Chriſt conſiſts in the croſſe alone: whereby it happens that they which are ſuch may ſeem rather worthy of pity and amendment, then perſecution and perdition.*

Pag. 28. *What part of time.*

Pag. 48. *How it may be that Iſrael may be rejected, but that together the Covenant of God eſtabliſhed with* Abraham *and his ſeed ſhould ſeem to be made void.*

In the margin. The credit of that promiſe, Gen. 17. 7,8. *doth preſently appear to be brought into danger by the rejecting of the Jews, and the excluſion of them out of the Covenant of God, ſith they are born of* Abraham *according to the fleſh, ſo (ſaith he) it appeares to them that look upon the firſt face of things.*

The Apoſtle ſhews, that therefore the word of the Covenant, and divine promiſes made to Iſrael failed not, or was made void, although a great part of the Jews were unbelieving, becauſe thoſe promiſes of the Covenant are of God, not to them properly who were to come from the ſeed of Abraham *according to the fleſh, but to thoſe, who were to be ingraffed into the family of* Abraham *by vertue of divine promiſe.*

Pag. 49. *The argument of the Apoſtle to prove the Covenant of God entred into with* Abraham *doth not comprehend all the poſterity of* Abraham *in its skirt, we think ſhould be thus ſimply framed.* Eſau *and* Jacob *were of the poſterity of* Abraham, *but God did not comprehend both of theſe in his Covenant with* Abraham. *Therefore not all the poſterity of* Abraham. *It is proved that God did not comprehend both in the Covenant of grace, becauſe he did not comprehend* Eſau *the elder, but* Jacob *the younger.*

Pag. 50. *There are many of the ſeed of* Abraham *to whom the word of promiſe doth not belong, as* Iſmael, *and* Iſmaelites. *But if ſo there be many of the ſeed of* Abraham *to whom the word of promiſe doth not belong, then the rejection of many Jews who are of the ſeed of* Abraham *doth not make void the word of promiſe.*

In the margin. Calvin *gathers hence, in that any is the ſeed of* Abraham *the promiſe made to* Abraham *belongs to him: but the anſwer is mani-*

feſt,

feſt, that promiſe underſtood of ſpirituall bleſſing, pertaines not to the carnall ſeed of Abraham, *but to the ſpirituall, as the Apoſtle himſelfe hath interpreted it,* Rom. 4. & 9. *For if you underſtand the carnall ſeed, now that promiſe will belong to none of the Gentiles, but to thoſe alone who are begotten of* Abraham *and* Iſaac *according to the fleſh.*

He teacheth alſo that the promiſes of God are not tied to the carnall birth; but to belong onely to the believing and ſpirituall poſterity. For they are not the ſons of Abraham, *who are of* Abraham *according to the fleſh, but who are according to the ſpirit.*

Pag. 51. *In the Margin. The inculcation alſo of the ſeed ſheweth that onely the elect and effectually called are noted, the Apoſtle ſo interpreting this place,* Rom. 9. 8. Gal. 3. 16. & 4. 28.

Pag. 52. *That baptiſme doth not certainly ſeale in all the children of believers the grace of God (ſith among them ſome are abſolutely reprobated, even by an antecedent decree of God from eternity) and therefore believers are to doubt of the truth of Gods Covenant,* I am thy God, and the God of thy ſeed after thee.

Pag. 58. *To be a ſon of* Abraham *doth declare nothing elſe but to be freely elected,* Rom. 9. 8. *and to tread in the ſteps of the faith of* Abraham, Rom. 4. 12. *and to doe the workes of* Abraham, *Joh.* 8. 39. *From which is rightly gathered certain expectation of ſalvation to come,* Rom. 8. 29.

Pag. 69. *In the Margin. Infants in their parents, grandfathers, great grandfathers, grandfathers grandfathers have refuſed the grace of the Goſpel, by which act they have deſerved, that they ſhould be forſaken of God. For I would to me, &c. For it is the perpetuall reaſon of the Covenant of God, that ſons are comprehended and reckoned in parents.*

To which Dr Twiſſe *thus oppoſeth in his anſwer. Nor any where in ſacred Scripture is it ſignified, that God hath made ſuch a Covenant with man fallen, that if he would believe, he ſhould obtaine grace to him and his poſteritie; on the contrary, if he ſhould not believe, he ſhould loſe grace for him and his poſteritie, which kinde of Covenant all Divines acknowledge to have been entered into with* Adam *under the Condition of obedience.*

Pag. 71. *In the Margin. It is manifeſt that the believers marrying with Gentiles are guilty of uncleanneſſe, and to be kept from all communication of the fraternitie from the Letters of the Apoſtle, ſaying,* that with ſuch meat is not to be eaten.

Pag. 73. *Firſt, becauſe the reaſon is uncertaine, for though it ſometimes be ſo done, yet for the moſt part it is otherwiſe.*

He

He ſpake in the preterperfect tenſe, hath been ſanctified, not, ſhall be ſanctified, ſignifying a thing already determined and finiſhed, and not a thing for the time to come uncertain either to be wiſhed or expected.

The believing wife may with a good conſcience keep company with the unbelieving husband (for why ſhould anothers conſcience defile her?) Therfore it is ſaid, the unbelieving not in himſelf, but in his wife (that is, in reſpect of his wife) is holy. The ſame we are to judge of the other member.

Pag. 74. *This is the minde of the Apoſtle that he may teach, that the believer is not to depart from the unbelieving yokefellow, conſenting to dwell together. For proving of which an argument from an uncertain event, and by accident is equally unfit as a little before. Hence that opinion is refuted that then when the unbeliever ſhall be converted, holy children will be begotten. For what if that never be?*

Pag. 76. *Of that ceremoniall holineſſe what ſhall I ſay? It came into* Auguſtines *minde, but good God! how ſtrange? verily ſome things are ſo abſurd, that they deſerve not to be refuted. Well. The Apoſtle hath ſaid, that if the unbelieving husband be not ſanctified in the believing wife, it will be that the children borne from thence are uncleane. Therefore all ſo borne are uncleane, or elſe the Apoſtle ſpake falſe. What then? Are all borne of thoſe parents whereof one is not ſanctified in the other begotten in the monethly courſes? Doe unbelieving husbands never uſe their wives but in their moncthly courſes? So it muſt be verily, or this interpretation is ridiculous.*

Of that Covenant-holineſſe what ſhall I ſay? It came into Chamiers, Calvins, *&c. minds, but good God! how ſtrange? verily ſome things are ſo abſurd, that they deſerve not to be refuted. Well! The Apoſtle hath ſaid, that if the unbelieving husband be not ſanctified in the believing wife, it will be that the children borne from thence will be uncleane. Therefore all that are ſo borne are uncleane, or the Apoſtle hath ſaid that which is falſe. What then? Are all borne of thoſe parents whereof one is not ſanctified in the other, without the Covenant of grace? Doe fornicating or unbelieving parents never beget children that ſhall be within the Covenant of grace, or federally holy? So it muſt be verily, or this interpretation is ridiculous.*

Pag. 77. *In the Margin. But there is no ſtraiter friendſhip then of husband and wife, which requires communion of affections, body, off-ſpring, laſtly of the whole life: which all Nations have with great conſent believed to be a thing truly holy, that is not found out by man, but by God.*

Pag. (75) *By this argument that ſanctity is excluded which ſome have brought*

brought from education. For by that the argument of the Apoſtle is altogether weakened. For this is uncertaine. For all know and experience teacheth, that neither all husbands are wonne, which alſo the Apoſtle implies, nor that all children obey holy education. Beſides, if any obey, yet this effect is accidentall, and not from the nature of marriage it ſelfe.

Pag. 89. *But ſith ſtrangers waſhed and not circumciſed were held with thoſe Lawes onely which God gave to all mankinde, it is eaſie to be underſtood that this waſhing was among old inſtitutions, ariſing as I think after the great deluge, in memory of the world purged. Whence that famous ſpeech among the Greekes, The ſea waſhed away all the evils of men. Certainly, we reade even in the Epiſtle of* Peter, *that Baptiſme is anſwerable to the flood.*

Pag. 91. *It was to be added, that not onely to himſelfe and in himſelfe, but alſo for our uſe Chriſt be determined to be ſuch, and ſo great, that nothing be wanting in him, and that in him alone we may get all things requiſite to the true and ſaving knowledge of God. Therefore having gotten fulneſſe in Chriſt, wherefore is there need either of humane wiſdome, or the vaine inventions, or ceremonies of men, laſtly any other thing added beſides Chriſt?*

Pag. 146. *In the margin. It was knowne to the* Jews *that God hath been wont to give this honour to Prophets, that he would beſtow his gifts on others at the Prophets prayers, of which impoſition of hands was a ſigne. It is manifeſt alſo from* Gen. 48. 14, 15. *that in that rite prayers were wont to be conceived for children. Thence it hath been alwayes obſerved by the* Hebrews, *that they would bring children to thoſe, who were believed to excell others in holineſſe, to be commended in their prayers to God by laying on of hands: which cuſtome as yet continues with them. Now this cuſtome Chriſt approving, ſhewes that the faith and prayers of others profit alſo that age.*

Pag. 152. *As for that which* Eraſmus *ſubjoynes, that* John *firſt baptized, then preached baptiſme, it is ſuch that indeed it ſeems not to need refutation. For what? When* John *did ſay, Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand, did he not teach thoſe whom he was about to baptize? yea verily, unleſſe he had firſt taught to what end he did baptize, who at laſt would have come to his baptiſme? Certainly, ſith Sacraments are ſeales, it is neceſſary that the doctrine goe before which they ſigne.*

Pag. 153. *In the margin. All theſe rites of profeſſion of faith, &c. had their originall from the very inſtitution of baptiſme, nor ought they to be omitted, onely to be diſpenſed with reſpect to age.*

FINIS.